Vol. XLIII NEW SERIES Nos. 3 & 4

The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society

JANUARY & APRIL 1953
PUBLISHED BY THE MYTHIC SOCIETY
AT THE DALY MEMORIAL HALL, CENOTAPH ROAD, BANGALORE-2.

America $. 3 India Rs. 5-0-0 Foreign 9 Sh. 4 d.

NOTICE

The Mythic Society having been registered as an Associate Society of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, Rule 105 of the Rules of that Society governing the privileges of Members of Associate Societies is published for information.

Rule 105:—Members of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and of Branches and Associate Societies are entitled, while on furlough or otherwise temporarily resident within the limits of Great Britain and Ireland, to the use of the Library as Non-resident Members, and to attend the Meeting of the Society other than Special General Meetings; and in the case of any Member of any Society aforesaid applying for election as a Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, nomination as laid down in Rule 4 shall not be necessary.

S. SRIKANTAYA

General Secretary and Treasurer

The Mythic Society

BANGALORE-2.

The Secretary requests that :

(1) Every member will kindly introduce at least one friend to the Society during the current year and thus help to popularise the work of the Society.

(2) Members who can afford it will help to build up a Capital Fund by converting their ordinary membership into life membership.

(3) Members who have not yet remitted their subscriptions will kindly remit them on receipt of this issue of the Journal.

(4) Members will be so good as to send us odd copies of Nos. 1 to 4 of Volumes VI, VIII and IX of the QJMS. If they so desire, the copies will be paid for at Rs. 1-8-0 each issue.

CONTENTS

PAGES

The Kodumbalur Chiefs and the Revival of the Colas
By K. V. SUBRAHMANYA AIYER, B.A. AND K. S. VAIDYANATHAN, B.A. ... 79— 94

Eastern Ganga Inscriptions in the Tamil Country
By DR. D. C. SIRCAR, M.A., Ph.D. ... 95—101

Srivilliputtur : History and Epigraphy
By V. SRINIVASAN ... 102—116

The Chronology of Andhra Dynasty and the Hathigumpha Inscription
By Y. V. RAMANA RAO ... 117—125

A Coronation 4,000 Years ago
By F. R. SELL ... 126—128

Correspondence ... 129—147

The Javantinathapuram Inscription of Varaguna Maharaja
By M. VENKATARAMAYYA ... 129—137
By K. S. VAIDYANATHAN ... 137—147

Reviews : ... 148—150

Kadar of Cochin—S. S. (148-149); Indian Astrology (Ashtottari and Vinshottari Dashas)—S. S. (149); and Descriptive Catalogue of the Pali Manuscripts in the Adyar Library—S. S. (149-150).

WANTED

For Exchange or Price

Indian Antiquary: Vol. III. February
Vol. XIV. January

AVAILABLE

FOR SALE OR EXCHANGE

Indian Antiquary :

Vol. XV. Complete Bound Volume.

Vol. V. October 1876.

Vol. XI. January to June 1882.

Epigraphia Indica :

Vol. XI. Part IV, October 1911 ; Part V, January 1912 ; Part VI, April 1912 ; Part VIII, October 1912.

Vol. XII. Part 1, January 1913.

Vol. XV. Part 4, October 1919 and Part 8, October 1920.

Enquiries to be addressed to :

The General Secretary & Treasurer,
The Mythic Society (Daly Memorial Hall),
Cenotaph Road, Bangalore-2
(INDIA).

The
Quarterly Journal
of the
Mythic Society

Vol. XLIII] JANUARY & APRIL 1953 [Nos. 3 & 4

THE KODUMBALUR CHIEFS AND THE REVIVAL OF THE COLAS

By K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyer, B.A. and
K. S. Vaidyanathan, B.A.

It cannot but be of interest to know the story of the fall of one of the greatest monarchies that, for several centuries, wielded marvellous power, displayed high military talent and performed mighty deeds of valour, which contributed to the formation of an extensive empire in South India, that adorned the country with admirable monuments, raised for the first time with enduring materials defying the destructive powers of nature, which tell the greatness of the glory of their founders and which are the forerunners of innumerable others in subsequent ages; and that, above all, ushered in a new era of literary activity bringing with it the north Indian culture and fostering it with care and assiduity. It becomes all the more fascinating as the fall of this (Pallava) power is closely connected with the revival of another more ancient one that had been supplanted centuries ago.

The materials needed for the purpose are not abundant and the few that we have, lie scattered, uncared for. It shall be our endeavour to pick up the available materials and set them up in proper

order so that their real value and significance, that are not quite patent, may appear better.

Anaimaṅgalam grant, popularly known as the Leiden plates, which was the only authority for the Cōḷa History available for the pioneers in the field of Epigraphy and Archæology for a long time, did not throw any hint that the early Cōḷas had lost their kingdom, who had snatched it from them and when, and that it had to be got back. Nor does it say how or when it was regained. The grant simply mentioned that Vijayālaya was a descendant of Kiḷḷi and then proceeded to give an account of his successors. The epigraphical field season of 1906 was very eventful in that it brought out of oblivion simultaneously a fine structural monument that came into existence in the days of the Pallava king Aparājita with some inscriptions of his time and a set of copper-plates containing thirty-one leaves with a massive ring and seal which furnished a more detailed account of the Cōḷa family than the Leiden plates and revealed for once that Vijayālaya captured Tañchāpuṛi and built in it a shrine for Nis'umbasūdhini: and that his son and successor Āditya I defeated the Pallava Aparājita in battle and took possession of his dominions. The political events leading upto the capture of Tanjore by Vijayālaya and the acquisition of the Pallava kingdom by Āditya remain to be traced. We have to learn how these feats of arms were effected by the father and the son and who helped them in their enterprise. We have also no information as to the immediate ancestry of Vijayālaya. The statement in the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu plates has since been supported by further discoveries. One of the Tillasthānam inscriptions not only speaks of Āditya's extending his territory into Toṇḍaināḍu but also informs us that he bore the surname Rājakēśarivarman and that he and the Cēra king of his day Kaṇṭha *alias* Sathāṇu Ravi, powerful of his elephant forces, bestowed honours on a chief who evidently had rendered valuable help to both of them. The Kanyākumari *praśasti* states that Āditya I, also called Kōdaṇḍarāma, killed Aparājita.

Vijayālaya's capture of Tañchāpuri was a very bold attempt for a newly rising king and it is certain that in this he must have

been supported by some powerful chief. The result of the capture must have shattered for once the power of the Muttaraiyaṉs, who were not only having possession of this place till then, but were the chief supporters of the members of the second dynasty of the Pallavas.

We know that on the death of Paramēśvaravarman II, the Pallava country was without a ruler and that a deputation consisting of the *Mātras*, *Mūlaprakṛtis* and the *Ghaṭakayar* waited on Hiraṇyavarman Mahārāja and succeeded in getting for the vacant Pallava throne at Kāñchi no less a person than that of the king's own son (Nandivarman) Pallavamalla. It is recorded and the event is sculpturally represented in the Vikuṇṭha Perumāḷ temple at Kāñchi when this prince Pallavamalla came to the city of Conjeeveram accompanied by Dharaṇikoṇḍapōśar he was assisted by a large force under the command of Pallavadi Araiyar and was received by Kāḍakka Muttaraiyar and other feudatories as well as the members of the assembly of merchants and the *Mūlaprakṛtis* and duly crowned king under the name Nandivarman and surname Viḍēlviḍugu and was invested with the usual insignia of Pallava royalty.

The part played by the Dharaṇikoṇḍa Pōśar, Pallavadi Araiyar and Kāḍakka Muttaraiyar and others in joining with the *Mūlaprakṛtis*, ministers, etc. in getting and crowning Nandivarman Pallavamalla as king of the Pallava country effectively prevented the Cōḷas from availing themselves of one of the finest opportunities to regain and revive their lost power. Further the successors of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla *viz.* Dantivarman, Nandivarman III and Nṛipatuṅga were ably supported by the successive members of the Muttaraiyar family. They became the chief feudatories (*Pēradiyaraiyar*) of Pallavas and maintained a strong hold on the bordering territory of Trichinopoly, Pudukottai and Tanjore and made the Kōnāḍu chiefs serve under them. One of the chief officers (*Pēradiyaraiyar*) of Pallavamalla's son Dantivarman was Mārapiḍuvaṉār or Mārapiḍugu. He figures in a fifth year record of Dantivarman discovered at Kunnāṇḍārkōyil (Kulattur taluk of Pudukottai).[1] What is more interesting is that he had under him

1. No. 17 of Pudukottai Inscriptions.

as servant (*aḍiyān*), a certain Kalimūrkka Iḷavaraiyan̲ whose proper name was Vāli Vaḍugan̲, evidently a member of the Koḍumbāḷūr family.[2] Another Muttaraiyan chief that was in the service of Dantivarman eleven years later *i.e.* in his sixteenth year, was Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyan̲ *alias* Kuvāvan̲ S'āttan̲ who excavated the rock cut cave at Malaiyaḍippaṭṭi.[3] A certain Viḍēlviḍugu Viḷuppēr Araisan̲ *alias* S'āttan̲ Māran̲ had for his mother Perumbiḍugu Perundēvi.[4] He has been tentatively taken to be a contemporary of Nandivarman.[5] Nandivarman III had for his feudatory a certain Mārapiḍugu Iḷaṅgōvēḷ[6] and in Nṛipatunga's time flourished another Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyan̲.[7] One of the inscriptions of Kuḍumiyāmalai [8] states that Varaguṇanaṭṭi, the queen of S'embiyan̲ Irukkuvēḷ,[9] evidently a Koḍumbāḷūr chief, was the daughter of Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyan̲. This queen figures in a sixth year record of Parakēsarivarman̲. The late Sri. Venkayya has taken S'embiyan̲ Irukkuvēḷ to be identical with Bhūti Vikramakēsarin̲ on account of his queen's name Varaguṇanaṭṭi. This identification is highly improbable as will be shown in the sequel.

From what has been said above it will be plain that the Muttaraiyan̲s not only took a prominent part in installing king Nandivarman II Pallavamalla on the Pallava throne when Paramēsvarvarman II died and strengthened their own positon but were strongly supporting the second dynasty of the Pallavas for nearly two centuries and were keeping under them the members of

2. Mārapidugu-ēri at Ālambākkam and Mārapidugu Peruṅkiṇaru at Tiruveḷḷarai (Trichinappalli district), the latter of which was sunk by Vijayanalluḷān̲, younger brother of Kamban Araiyan̲ in the fourth year of Dantivarman must both have been called after the chief mentioned above. See *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XI. Pp. 155ff and Vol. XIII. P. 38.

3. No. 18 of Pudukottai Inscriptions.

4. No. 402 of *A. R.* 1906.

5. *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XIII. P. 138.

6. No. 88 of *A. R.* 1910.

7. No. 19 of Pudukottai Inscriptions.

8. No. 337 of *A. R.* 1904.

9. It will be pointed out below that this was another name for Bhūti Vikramakēs'arin's son Parāntaka,

the other border family of Koḍumbāḷūr Yādavas against whom they had an ancient feud.

The combined action of the Pallavas and the Muttaraiyaṉs effectively kept back the Cōḷas, whose territory the Pallavas had occupied a long time ago. This position of the various powers must be clearly borne in mind to understand the future.

At this stage it will be well to know something about the feud between the Muttaraiyaṉs and the Kōnāḍu chiefs. Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ *alias* S'uvaraṉ Māraṉ (eighth century A. D.) is said, in the S'endalai pillar inscriptions,[10] to have gained victories at Koḍumbāḷūr (also called Koḍumbai) and Kaṇṇaṉūr. At Kaṇṇaṉūr the arms of the king, it is said, were directed against the people of Kōnāḍu and that the latter were forced to take refuge in a hill nearby. Though the enemy at Koḍumbāḷūr is not specifically stated, it may be assumed to have been fought against the Kōnāḍu king of the time, the place being the capital of that king.

We may by the way note how the Pallavas came to have possession of the Cōḷa territory. From the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu and the Vēlūrpāḷayam plates we are led to believe that Cōḷa aggression, at first resulted in depriving the Pallavas of their capital Kāñchi. We are told in the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu plates that the Cōḷa king Karikāla, who is said to have defeated Trilōchana Pallava, beautified the city of Kāñchi, the capital of the Pallavas, with gold; and the Pallava king Kumāraviṣṇu had to capture it.[11] The recapture of Kāñchi was followed by a further attack on the Cōḷas by Kumāraviṣṇu's son and successor Buddhavarman.[12] Not long after, Simhaviṣṇu conquered the whole of the Cōḷa country which was watered by the river Kāvērī and was ornamented by the paddy fields and areca palms. The latter's conquest was not a passing event. It ended in the permanent occupation of the Cōḷa country by the Pallavas. The continuous possession by the Pallavas of the region watered by the Kāvērī is clearly evidenced by the formation and grant of rich villages as Śimhaviṣṇu

10. *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XIII. Pp. 134ff.
11. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. P. 510. V. 8.
12. *Ibid.*

chaturvēdimaṅgalam, *i.e.* Kañjaṉūr, Naraśiṅgamaṅgalam, *i.e.* Tiruvaḍaturai, Mahēndramaṅgalam etc. and by the excavation of the rock-cut caves and structural monuments with inscriptions found at Tiruchchirāppaḷḷi, etc. and many parts of the Pudukottai State. Besides the Cōḷas, the Yādava Irukkuvēḷs of Koḍumbāḷūr were vitally affected by the Pallava expansion and thus had to put up hard fights.

Though the Cōḷas had been deprived of their kingdom, the Pallavas were not left in undisputed possession of the (Cōḷa) territory which they had newly acquired. The Pāṇḍyas began to wage wars against the Pallavas as did the other powers of South India *viz.* the Kēraḷa, the Cāḷukya etc. which resulted in the weakening of the Pallavas. It is unnecessary to go into the details about them here.

The Vēlūrpāḷayam plates speak of a subordinate chief of Nandivarman III, who bore the name Kumārāṅkuśa and the title Cōḷa Mahārāja. Of him the plates say that he was 'the heroic head jewel of the Cōḷa race, that the glory of his powers was well-known, that his liberality was that of Rādhēya and that his conduct was upright.' Though we are not informed of the ancestry of Kumārāṅkuśa, the plates leave no doubt that he came of the ancient stock of the Cōḷas and was held in the esteem which he deserved by his birth. We are told that at the request of this Cōḷa Mahārāja the Pallava king gave the village of Tirukkāṭṭuppaḷḷi with its *pañchavāras* of 1,000 *kāḍi* of paddy and with all other income which the king used to realise from it, as a *dēvadāna*, to the temple of Yajñēśvarattu Mahādēva.

The date of the record in which this Cōḷa Mahārāja figures is *circa* A. D. 818, the sixth year of the Pallava king and it cannot be far removed from the date of rise of Vijayālaya and his settlement as an independent king after a feat of arms. His capture of Tañchāpuri is indeed a very bold endeavour. As there is no doubt that the city was in the hands of the Muttaraiyaṉs, Vijayālaya must be considered to have wrested it from them. It is not unlikely that this action was preceded by something which gave the rising Cōḷa sufficient strength not only to dare an attack on

the Muttaraiyaṉs who were holding very high positions under the Pallavas but also to earn the displeasure of the latter who were at the time wielding suzerain power in the Dekhan. What gave the boldness and strength to the Cōḷa at this juncture was, we are inclined to think, the alliance which the Cōḷas had formed with the Yādava king of Kōnāḍu, who had an ancient feud with the Muttaraiyaṉs and who had been made to hold a servile position under them (*aḍikkīḻ*). Besides, they were the bitter enemies of the Pallavas, being equal partners with the Cōḷas in the sufferings caused by the Pallava advance in the south. In this connection it is worth noting that the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription tells us that a Cōḷa princess named Anupamā of matchless beauty was married to the Yādava king Samarābhirāma of Kōnāḍu and that she bore him the son named Bhūti, who earned by his own military deeds the significant surname Vikramakēs'ari *i.e.* 'a lion in prowess.' Samarābhirāma was ruling over Kōnāḍu in the years A. D. 883-897, when his son Bhūti-Vikramakēśarin, who was at the time a *yuvarāja*—as indicated by the title Iḷangōvēḷ assumed by him—was with his two queens Naṅgai Varaguṇa Perumāṉār and Kaṟṟaḷi, staying in, if not solely in occupation of the country, which was previously under the possession of the Muttaraiyaṉs. This Kōnāḍu prince figures as a feudatory of the Cōḷa king Rājakēśarivarman Āditya I. The position occupied by Vikramakēśarin under the Cōḷa king Rājakēśari Āditya I and his taking the place of the Muttaraiyaṉs, can prove that his father Samarābhirāma took an active part in shattering the Muttaraiyaṉs when the Cōḷa king's father Vijayālaya captured the city of Tañchāpuri from the Muttaraiyaṉs and that Vijayālaya had after capturing the city of Tañchāpuri from the Muttaraiyaṉs, set up his relative Samarābhirāma as his feudatory. Though it is only future discoveries that must show what relationship existed between Vijayālaya and Kumārāṅkuśa and whose daughter the Cōḷa princess Anupamā was, this much is certain: (i) that Vijayālaya was not far removed in point of time from Kumārāṅkuśa, as the latter figures in a sixth year record of the Pallava king Nandivarman III, *i.e.* in A. D. 818; and (ii) that the former had a rule extending upto A. D. 870, when his son Āditya I succeeded him and reigned till

A. D. 907, the date of accession of Parāntaka I (whose reign lasted from that date till A. D. 953). That the marriage of the Cōḷa princess Anupamā with the Yādava king Samarābhirāma of Kōnāḍu must have taken place sufficiently early is certain for we find her son Bhūti Vikramakēs'arin, with his two wives Naṅgai Varaguṇa Perumāṉār and Kaṟṟaḷi, remained while yet a *yuvarāja* (crown prince) as a feudatory and powerful ally of the Cōḷa king Rājakēs'arivarman Āditya I. Had the above facts been recognised, it would have been clear that Samarābhirāma, who married the Cōḷa princess Anupamā and whose son Bhūti was, must have been an elder contemporary of Āditya and his predecessor Vijayālaya, and was ruling over Kōnāḍu with his capital at Koḍumbāḷūr. Another factor to note is Bhūti Vikramakēs'ari's military achievements have not been appraised at their proper worth. The Koḍumbāḷūr Mūvarkōvil inscription states that he fought a sanguinary battle with the Pallavas and made the water of the Kāvērī red with the blood of the Pallava army. Rājakēs'ari Āditya I having killed Aparājita, the last of the Pallava kings, in some year prior to A. D. 890 corresponding to the twentieth year and extended the Çōḷa dominion into Toṇḍaināḍu, the encounter of the Koḍumbālur chief Vikramakēs'arin with the Pallavas must only have occurred either in that year if he had fought as an ally of the Cōḷa, or sometime before that date, if independently; and in either case, while he was yet a crown-prince. At any rate, it cannot be later for there could be no Pallava then. We are driven to this conclusion by the fact that he styled himself Iḷangōvēḷ (crown-prince) even as late as the twenty-seventh year inscription of Āditya I corresponding to A. D. 897 in which he figures. Another factor that contributed to a distortion of the true date of Bhūti is the identification of Vīra-Pāṇḍya, whom he is said to have conquered in the Mūvarkōvil inscription, with the Vīra Pāṇḍya who was opponent of Parāntaka II Sundara Cōḷa and his son Āditya II Karikāla; the last two Cōḷa kings were the great grandson and great-great grandson of Āditya I, Bhūti's overlord, ally and contemporary. This identification would not have been made if Bhūtī's success over the Pallavas had been given the consideration it deserved and had the date of

the inscription of Rājakēs'arivarman *i.e.* the twenty-seventh year of the reign in which he figures been noted. The high regnal year—leaving apart the palæographical or other considerations—could have pointed out at once that the overlord and contemporary was Āditya I, for it was only he and the distant Rājarāja who had such high regnal years.

The four copper plate charters of the early Pāṇḍyas that have been brought to light trace the members of the main line of the family leading to Rājasiṁha Pāṇḍya. It is just possible that there were others whose names have been omitted being outside the scope of the *pras'asti* writer to treat of them. It is also not very unlikely that the rule of the Pāṇḍya country was conducted by more kings than one, ruling at the same time over different parts of the kingdom, the chief among them having his seat of government at Madhurai, as we actually find it in the time of the Pāṇḍyan war of succession of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D. This possibility is suggested (i) by the reference to Māya Pāṇḍya in the reign of S'rī Māṟa the successor of Varaguṇa Mahārāja, (ii) by the mention of a ruler named Vīra Pāṇḍya, whom Bhūti Vikramakēs'ari the Koḍumbāḷūr chief and a contemporary of the Cōḷa king Āditya I, is said to have defeated, and (iii) by the mention of a servant of Vīra Pāṇḍya in an epigraph of S'aḍaiya Māṟaṉ discovered at Tiruppuḍaimarudūr in the Ambasamudrum taluk of the Tinnevelly district dated in the 21 + 8th year of reign, the method of dating suggesting that the king is Rājasiṁha III.

This Vīra Pāṇḍya might have been either a contemporary or predecessor of Rājasiṁha.

The end of the ninth century and the beginning of the tenth synchronised with the rule of the Cōḷa king Āditya I, the Pallava king Aparājita and his opponent Varaguṇa Pāṇḍya II, the Koḍumbāḷūr chief Bhūti Vikramakēs'arin, and his opponents Vīra Pāṇḍya and Vañchi-vēḷ.

Bhūti's actual rule over Kōnāḍu whenever it commenced, seems to have ended in A.D. 913, from which date we find the records of his eldest son Parāntaka. As such his encounter with Vīra Pāṇḍya must have taken place before that date, when he was crown-prince or ruler. The latter position he must have held

after A.D. 897, though the exact date is not known. The utmost period of his rule is fifteen years from A.D. 898 to 913.

Rājasiṁha III's latest known regnal year is twenty-one. He appears as the opponent of the Cōḷa king Parāntaka I in A.D. 918. Presuming this date to coincide with the last year of his reign, his accession would be A.D. 897. Now this date for the accession of Rājasiṁha III would give his father a rule from *circa* A.D. 876 to 897, for Varaguṇa's Tiruchchendūr inscription is dated in the thirteenth year opposite to some year which is lost and which may temporarily be taken to be two and this date A. D. 877 is about ten years before the date of demise of Aparājita and about seven years after the death of Nṛpatuṅga. By this, one thing becomes certain, that Vīra Pāṇḍya the king defeated by Bhūti cannot be a successor of Rājasiṁha III. It would be more so if Rājasiṁha continued to live after A. D. 918, as it seems very likely, his date of accession would be carried to a later date than A. D. 897. It thus becomes clear that Bhūti's opponent Vīra Pāṇḍya must either be a contemporary or a predecessor of Rājasiṁha III. He must have been a collateral member or a subordinate of the main line of the Pāṇḍyas.

The texts of the inscriptions published in Volume VIII of the *South Indian Inscriptions* contains a number of records which reveal to us the names of some of the members of the ancient Yādava family of Iruṅgōvēḷs who ruled over Kōnāḍu with their capital at Koḍumbāḷūr. These inscriptions furnish (i) the patronymics [13] of the chiefs which indicate unerringly their

13. Instances are not wanting where patronymics have been confounded with the names of the overlords and serious errors committed. For instance see page (15) of the introduction to Volume III of the *South Indian Inscriptions.* "It is interesting to note that the general S'iriyavēḷâr or S'iṟuvēḷa was a member of the royal family being the son of the daughter of king Parāntaka I who was perhaps identical with the Cōḷa princess Anupamā the queen of Samarābhirāma of the Iruṅgōḷa race (No. 121)." We need only say about this that the distortion of facts could go no further. The real facts recorded in the inscriptions are: Samarābhirāma married the Cōḷa princess Anupamā and had by her the son Vikramakēs'ari and this Vikramakes'ari gave his daughter in marriage to the Cōḷa Parāntaka I's son Ariñjaya whose son was Sundara Cōḷa Parāntaka II and Siriyavēḷâr or Siruvēḷ was his general.

position in the family pedigree, (ii) their feudatory surnames which point to their position as ruler, crown prince etc. (iii) the names of their overlords which serve to show the approximate (or even exact) time when they flourished and lastly (iv) the benefactions made by them We shall start with the inscriptions which mention Bhūti (Vikramakēs'ariṉ) and his queens and then trace their descendants with the help of the patronymics and carry further the genealogy furnished in the Mūvarkōvil inscription of Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs. We shall at the end add also a table showing the contemporaneity of the members of the South Indian families such as the Cōḷa, the Pāṇḍya, the Pallava and the Koḍumbāḷūr.

Bhūti Vikramakēs'arin's actual date of accession to his throne at Koḍumbāḷūr may be approximately ascertained from his successor's dates. Mūvarkōvil inscription had informed us that Bhūti had two sons by his queen Kaṟṟaḷi. They were Parāntakavarmaṉ and Ādityavarmaṉ. Stone inscriptions add that he had a daughter who was married to Ariñjaya, the son of the Cōḷa king Parāntaka I. Prefixing the father's name, these three get the double names Pūdi (or Bhūti) Parāntaka, Pūdi Āditya (or Āditya, Piḍāraṉ *i. e.* Āditya Bhaṭāra) and Pūdi Āditya Biḍāri (Bhaṭārikā). To these names are added their feudatory titles and epithets expressive of kingship Irukkuvēḷ or subordinate position or crown-prince Iḷaṅgōvēḷ. Numerous epigraphs have been discovered in the Tiruchchirappalli district and Pudukkottai State in which these three members figure.

There are three inscriptions in which Bhūti or his queens figure. All of them come from Tiruppalatturai and belong to the reign of King Rājakēs'arivarman,[14] who at this time cannot but be the Cōḷa king Āditya I. In this connection it may also be noted

14. *S.I.I.* Vol. VIII. No. 560. Rājakēs'arivarman twenty-seventh year Teṉṉavaṉ Iḷaṅgōvēḷâṉ *alias* Maravaṉ Pūdiyār. gift of land.

Ibid. No. 568. Rājakēs'arivarman, Date lost. Registers the gift of a lamp by Queen Varaguṇa Perumâṇâr.

Ibid No. 581. Rājakēs'arivarman. Date lost. Gift for offering lamps etc. by Nangai Kaṟṟaḷippiràṭṭiyàr, Queen of Teṉṉavaṉ Iḷaṅgōvēḷâṉ *alias* Maravaṉ Pūdiyār.

that the record which registers the gifts by Bhūti bears the high regnal year twenty-seven to which no other Cōḷa king is entitled at this time. Remember in this connection that Bhūti was the fighter of the Pallava forces in or before A. D. 888.

It being assured that Bhūti Vikramakēs'arin and his two queens Varaguṇā and Kaṟṟaḷi were the contemporaries of Rājakēs'ari Āditya I from the records noted above, and from Vikramakēs'arin's encounter with the Pallavas it becomes plain that the period of ten years from about A.D. 888 to A.D. 897, when we find Bhūti Vikramakēs'arin as crown prince and feudatory of the Cōḷa king, formed part of the period of the rule of Samarābhirāma over Kōnāḍu, though how long, before and after, he was ruler, it is not known, and that the Parakēs'arivarman in whose reign Vikramakēs'arin's two sons Parāntaka and Āditya and daughter Āditya Piḍāri and even the grandson Āditya Bhūti (or Āditya Vikramakēs'arin) figure is the Cōḷa king Parāntaka I (the son and successor of Āditya I), whose reign extended over half a century from A. D. 907; and this is further vouchsafed by the marriage of Bhūti Vikramakēs'ariṉ's daughter with Parāntaka I's son Ariñjaya. Pūdi Āditta Piḍāri figures in the inscriptions of Parakēs'ari *i.e.* Parāntaka I dated in the second, fourth, eighth, tenth and the fourteenth years (A. D. 909 to 921). Pūdi Parāntaka with his surname S'embiyaṉ Irukkuvēḷ of which the second part indicates that he was the ruler of Kōnāḍu, and his queens Puliyūr-nāṭṭ-aḍigaḷ, Varguṇa naṭṭi the daughter of Muttaraiyar, S'iṅgaḷanimmaddi Naṅgai Nandi and S'ōḷapperundēviyār *alias* Peranaṅgai, appear in the records of Parakēsari (Paranataka I) dated in the sixth, tenth, thirteenth and nineteenth years of reign (A. D. 913 to 926).[15] As no earlier date than A. D. 913 is found for this king we may regard it as marking the end of the rule of Vikramakēs'ariṉ. Vikramakēs'ariṉ's second son Āditya whose full name was Pūdi-Ādittapiḍāraṉ (Bhūti Āditya Bhaṭāra), with his feudatory surname S'embiyaṉ Iruṅgōvēḷ, indicating that he held the position of a crown-prince (as he ought)

15. Nos. 646, 657, 666 and 668 of *S. I. I.* Vol, VIII and Nos. 45 and 52 of Pudukottai Inscriptions.

figures in an inscription of Parakēs'arivarman (Parāntaka I) dated in the twentieth year of reign (A. D. 927).[16] This fact would show that his elder brother was the ruler on this date.

Inspite of Pūdi Parāntakaṉ having had several queens and having had also sons, none of the latter seems to have been aged enough to succeed him in A. D. 926-7 when perhaps he died and the rulership of Kōnāḍu passed on to his younger brother's son Ādittaṉ Pūdi (also called Ādittaṉ Vikramakēs'ariṉ): he figures with his feudatory surname Madhurāntakaṉ Irukkuvēḷ the second part of the surname indicating that he was the ruler—in the inscriptions of Parakēs'ari (Parāntaka I) dated in the twenty-first, twenty-second and twenty-third years of reign (A. D. 928-930).[17] Those were the initial years of his reign. He appears to have been the last Yādava feudatory of Parāntaka I. It is likely that he reigned till the end of his overlord's rule or the beginning of the reign of Sundara Cōḷa Parāntaka II.

Some other members of the Irukkuvēḷ family are known from inscriptions and they have to be assigned their proper places. One of them figures as crown-prince and is named Vīras'ōḷa Ilaṅgōvēḷ *alias*[18] Parāntakaṉ Kuñjaramallaṉ. He figures in a third year record of Rājakēsarivarman. To judge from his name this prince may be considered as one of the sons of Pūdi Parāntakaṉ. The next name to notice is Mahimālaya Irukkuvēḷ. His proper name was Parāntaka Vīras'ōḷaṉ, from the first part of which it may be concluded that he was also the son of Pūdi Parāntakaṉ. He must have been too young to succeed his father when he died and the rulership had to pass on to Āditya's son Ādittaṉ Pūdi (or Vikramakēs'ariṉ) as has been noted above. The inscriptions in which Mahimālaya Irukkuvēḷ figures are dated in the third, fourth and tenth years of the reign of a Rājakēśarivarman[19] who may be identified with the Cōḷa king Parāntaka II *alias*

---

16. *S. I. I.* Vol. VIII. No. 601.

17. Nos. 335, 336 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection for 1904 and Pudukottai Inscriptions Nos. 63 and 65.

18. *S. I. I.* Vol. VIII. No. 694.

19. Pudukkottai Inscriptions Nos. 22, 24 and 30.

Sundara Cōḷa. As he was ruling over Kōnāḍu his inscriptions are found in the Pudukkottai State. The years corresponded to A. D. 958, 959 and 965.

The third member to notice is Parāntakaṉ S'iṟiyavēḷār. He was the general of the Cōḷa king Parāntaka II *alias* Sundara Cōḷa, and died fighting in Ceylon, in the ninth year of the king's reign in about A. D. 964. Several records of Rājakēsarivarman (Sundara Cōḷa) dated in the second, fourth and fifth years of reign register gifts made by the general and from them it is gathered that he was called Vīra Iruṅgōḷar and that he hailed from Koḍumbāḷūr. The general's wife was Rājādichchi and his daughter was Kuñjaramalli, and his son Vēḷāṉ Sundarasōḷaṉ. Like the two other members noticed above, S'iṟiyavēḷār was also a son of Pūdi Parāntakaṉ as the first part of his name indicates. A Sanskrit inscription of Tiruvisalūr speaking of him says:

Iruṅgōḷa-kula-pradīpah Pirāntakasy-ātmajavarga-varyah Dipam-mudā.

Sri-Visalūradhāmne Harāya babhrich-Chiṟuvēḷa-nāmā

This verse is simple and may be rendered thus: "The light of the Iruṅgōḷar family named S'iṟiyavēḷ, the best among the several sons of Parāntaka gave with delight a lamp to Hari who has his abode at S'rivisalūr." Of the *ātmaja-varga* (group of sons) of Parāntaka, we have noticed three *viz.* Parāntakaṉ Kuñjaramallaṉ, Parāntakaṉ Viras'ōḷaṉ and Parāntakaṉ S'iṟiyavēḷāṉ. One of them was the ruler of Kōnāḍu, another was a chief officer under Sundara Cōḷa and the third was that king's general. We do not know if there were others. In all the inscriptions in which the above mentioned member appears including the one under notice 'Parāntakan' is used as a patronymic of the Yādava chief and has we think no reference "to the family of the daughter of the king Parāntaka" as has been taken in *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 121. Here again it may be observed that since S'iṟiyavēḷāṉ of the Iruṅgōḷar family, the best among the host of sons of Parāntaka (*Parāntakasyātmajavarga varyah*) and even his daughter and wife figure in the inscriptions of Rājakēs'arivarman Sundara Cōḷa Parāntaka II, there is no doubt that the Parakēs'arivarman in whose records solely, the chief's

father Parāntaka and his paternal uncle Āditya and paternal aunt Āditya Piḍāri appear must be identical with a predecessor and not a successor of Sundara Cōḻa. In speaking of Bhūti Vikramakēsariṉ, S'iṟiyavēḷār's grandfather and contemporary and ally of Āditya I, we have already observed how we are driven to the irresistible conclusion that this Parakēsarivarman must be Parakēsari Parāntaka I, the immediate successor of Rājakēsarivarman Āditya I.

Addenda and *Corrigenda*

Page	*line*	*for*	*read*
87	24	21+8th	2+18th
89	20	Pūdi Āditya Biḍāri	Pūdi Āditya Piḍāri
90	33	Sembiyaṉ Iruṅgōvēḷ	Sembiyaṉ Iḷaṅgōvēḷ
92	17	*dipam*	*dīpam*

Wherever °kēs'ari occurs read °kēsari.

(iii) Parakēsari Viras'ōḻaṉ.

(iv) Parākēsarivarman, thirteenth year. The queen of Kaṉṉaradēva named Pūdi Mādēvaḍigaḷ.[23] She may be the same as Naṅgai Pūdi Mādēvaḍigaḷ who appears in an inscription of the twenty-third year of the same king making a gift to the temple at Tirupparāytturai.[24]

20, No. 306 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection for 1906.
21, *S.I.I.* Vol, III. No. 98.
22. *Ibid.* Vol. VIII. No. 566.
23. *Ibid.* No. 665.
24, *Ibid.* No. 554.

Addenda and *Corrigenda*

Page	*line*	*for*	*read*
87	24	21+8th	2+18th
89	20	Pūdi Āditya Biḍāri	Pūdi Āditya Piḍāri
90	33	Sembiyaṉ Iruṅgōvēḷ	Sembiyaṉ Iḷangōvēḷ
92	17	*dipam*	*dīpam*

Wherever °kēs'ari occurs read °kēsari.

(v) A certain Rājarāja Iḷaṅgōvēḷāṉ figures in an inscription of the fourth year of Rājakēsarivarman. To judge from the name of the chief, the king may be the Cōḷa king Rājarāja I. In the same king's reign (seventh year) there was another member of the Irukkuvēḷ family. He was called Mummuḍis'ōḷan Irukkuvēl.[25]

The connection of these with the line given below remains to be ascertained.

Bhūti (Vikramakēsarin) *alias* Teṉṉavaṉ Iḷaṅgōvēḷar *alias* Māran Piḍuvaṉār.
Crown-prince in A. D. 883 to 897, defeated the Pallavas, and Vīra Pāṇḍya in *circa* A.D. 898 A.D. 913.

- Pūdi Āditta Piḍāriyār[26] *m* Ariñjaya
- Pūdi Parāntakaṉ *alias* S'embiyaṉ Irukkuvēl. *m*
  (1) Varaguṇanaṭṭi, daughter of Muttaraiyar
  (2) Puliyūrnāṭṭaḍigaḷ
  (3) S'iṅgaḷanimmaḍi
  (4) Naṅgai Nandi and
  (5) S'oḷapperundēviyār *aliās* Peranaṅgai,
  A.D. 913 to 927[27]
  - Parāntakaṉ Vīras'oḷaṉ *alias* Mahimālaya Irukkuvēḷ A.D. 958-965[30]
- Āditya Pūdi Āditta Piḍāraṉ *alias* S'embiyaṉ Iḷaṅgōvēḷ. A.D. 927
  - Madhurāntakaṉ Irukkuvēl *alias* Ādittaṉ Pūdi[28] (also called Ādittaṉ Vikramakēsari) A.D. 928/9 to *circa* A.D. 958[29]

---

25. Pudukottai, Nos. 23 and 24.

26. She figures in the second, fourth, eighth, tenth and fourteenth years of the reign of Parākēsarivarman (Nos. 619, 620, 62 , 698 and 618 of *S. I. I.* Vol. VIII).

27. As Āditya figures as Iḷaṅgō in A. D. 927, there is the likelihood of this year being the last year of Parāntakan S'embıyan Irukkuvēḷ.

28. No. 627 of *S.I.I.* Vol. VIII, dated in the twenty-second year of Parakēsari. Born in *Pūrattādi Nakṣatra.*

29. This date is what could be inferred from the successor's date.

30. Third, fourth and tenth years of Rājakēsarivarman.

Sync

800 A.D.

825 A.D.

850 A.D.

EASTERN GANGA INSCRIPTIONS IN THE TAMIL COUNTRY*

By Dr. D. C. Sircar, M.A., Ph.D.

There is an inscription on the east wall of the second prākāra of the Raṅganātha temple at S'rīraṅgam in the Trichinopoly district dated in the ninth regnal year of the Pāṇḍya king Māṟavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya who ascended the throne in A.D. 1216.[1] According to this record, the date of which falls in A.D. 1224-25, the managers of the temple of Raṅganātha colluded with the Oṭṭar to the detriment of the income of the temple. There are two inscriptions of the same period on the west wall of the rock near the Aruḷāla Perumāḷ temple at Conjeeveram in the Chingleput district.[2] The second of these two inscriptions is dated in the twentieth year (*Ādi* 12, *Saptamī*, Monday, *As'vati*) of the reign of Rājarājadeva (apparently the Cōḷa king Rājarāja III, A.D. 1216-46) and records the gift of one hundred and twenty-eight cows and four bulls by Aniyaṅkabhīmadeva-rāhutta (no doubt Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma III Rāuta, *circa* A. D. 1211-38), the lord of Kaliṅga, for four perpetual lamps in the temple. The other inscription is dated in the nineteenth year (*Mīna sudi pañchamī*, Wednesday, *Revatī*) of an unspecified reign and records the gift of the village of Uḍaiyakāmam in the Antarudra *viṣaya* by Somaladevī Mahādevī, queen of the Gaṅga Anantavarman-rāhuttarāya (*i.e.* Anaṅgabhīma III), for the daily worship and offerings to the god. The Gaṅga king, some of whose *birudas* are mentioned in the record, is stated to have been encamped at Abhinava-Vāraṇavāsi or Abhinava-Vārāṇasī which is often believed to be no other than Conjeeveram (Kāñchīpura), the find-spot of the records.

On the strength of the above three inscriptions, Dr. T. V. Mahalingam, who substantially follows Dr. N. Venkataramanayya,[3]

* Read at the Ahamedabad Session of the All-India Oriental Conference.

1. No. 53 of 1892, *S. I. I.* Vol. *IV*. P. 140. No. 500.

2. Nos. 444-45 of *1919*; *A. R. S. E*, 1919-20. P. 22.

3. *Bhārati*. Vol. *XXII*. 1945: Part 1. Pp. 16 ff; 541 ff; Part II. Pp. 57 ff.

believes in a Gaṅga invasion of the Tamil country as far as S'rīraṅgam near modern Trichinopoly by Anaṅgabhīma in the early years of the Cōḷa king Rājarāja III.[4] He further says: "This led to the prevalence of unsettled conditions in the area covered by the present Tanjore district and dislocated the temple worship at S'rīraṅgam." Both Dr. Venkataramanayya and Dr. Mahalingam take the word *oṭṭar* in the S'rīraṅgam inscription in the sense of the Oḍḍiyas or Oriyas: but while the former scholar (who depends on No. 444 of 1919 and ignores No. 445) appears to think that Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma III was present at Kāñchī in the nineteenth year of his own reign, the latter suggests that the Conjeeveram inscriptions indicating his presence at that place are dated in the regnal years of the Cōḷa king Rājarāja III. Although the astronomical details of the dates do not tally exactly with those of the expected dates in the reign of the Cōḷa king, there is little doubt that the nineteenth year of an unspecified reign mentioned in No. 444 should be attributed to the reign of Rājarāja III who is mentioned by name in No. 445. There are apparently some mistakes in the astronomical details of both the dates.[5]

The conclusion reached by Dr. Venkataramanayya and Dr. Mahalingam in regard to the interpretation of the above three inscriptions are open to very serious objections. In the first place, there is absolutely no evidence in favour of the identification of Abhinava-Vārāṇasī with Conjeeveram while there is definite proof to show that it was the name of the Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma's capital to be located at modern Cuttack, the chief city of Orissa. Secondly, it is impossible to believe that, if the Gaṅga king conquered the Tamil country and was present at Conjeeveram in that region, he would date his Conjeeveram inscriptions not in his own reckoning but in the regnal years of the Cōḷa king whom he had defeated. Thirdly, the Gaṅga king Anaṅgabhīma III was one of the most devout Vaiṣṇavas known from Indian history and it is impossible to think that, when he was himself present in the

4. *I. H. C.* Gwalior session: *List of Papers and Summaries*. Pp. 30-31.

5. *Ādi* 12, *Saptami As'vati* (*As'vinī*) in the twentieth regnal year of Rājarāja III tallies with July 8, A. D. 1235. But the week-day was Sunday and not Monday as given in the record.

Tamil country, he would have caused dislocation in the worship at the S'rīraṅgam temple of Raṅganātha who represents a form of Viṣṇu and is venerated by the Vaiṣṇavas throughout India. Fourthly, the interpretation of the word *oṭṭar* as the people of Orissa is extremely doubtful. Let us take up these four points one by one.

We know that the Gaṅgas had originally their capital at Kaliṅganagara which has been identified with modern Mukhalingam near Chicacole or S'rīkakulam. But the Gaṅga monarch Anantavarman Cōḍagaṅga (A. D. 1078-1147) conquered the Puri-Cuttack region of Orissa from the Somavaṁs'īs and his successors are known to have transferred the Gaṅga capital to the present Cuttack (Kaṭaka) area. This new Gaṅga capital is mentioned as Vārāṇasī-Kaṭaka in both the Puri Copper-plate inscriptions of Narasiṁha IV who ascended the throne about A. D. 1378.[6] The *Tārīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī* of Shams-i-Sirāj Afif, while describing Sultān Fīrūz Shāh's expedition against the kingdom of Jājnagar (*i.e.* the Gaṅga kingdom of Orissa) in A. D. 1360 during the reign of Bhānu III (*circa* A. D. 1352-78) mentions the same city on the river Mahānadī as Banārasī or Vārāṇasī.[7] The Nagari copper-plate inscription of king Anaṅgabhīma III himself, which I have recently edited in the *Epigraphia Indica*, records several grants of the king when he was stationed at the same city mentioned there as Vārāṇasī-Kaṭaka, Abhinava-Vārāṇasī and Abhinava-Vārāṇasī-Kaṭaka. There is no doubt that this city is the same as the modern Cuttack or Kaṭaka, the chief city of Orissa. A tradition recorded in the *Mādalā Pāñjī* [8] suggests that it was Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma III who built the city of Vārāṇasī (Abhinava-Vārāṇasī-Kaṭaka) and made it his capital. According to this tradition, a Gaṅga king named Anaṅgabhīma was at first ruling from the city called Chaudvāra-Kaṭaka on the northern bank of the Mahānadī. One day he crossed the river and reached the village of Vāravāṭi in the

6. Bhandarkar's List Nos. 1125; *J. A. S. B.* Vol. LXIV. Pt. 1. Pp. 136 ff and 151 ff,

7. Ray. *D. H. N. I*, Vol. I. P. 491,

8. Edited by A. B. Mahanti, Cuttack, 1940. P. 27.

Kudiṇḍā Daṇḍapāṭa on its southern bank where he noticed a *s'yāmala* bird (possibly a female cuckoo) killed by a *vaka* (Indian crane) near the temple of God Visves'vara. Considering it a good omen, the King built a city there and gave it the name Vāṇarās'ī-Kaṭaka (Vārāṇasī Kaṭaka). Then he left Chaudvāra-Kaṭaka and made the new city his residence. It will be seen that the Conjeeveram inscription of his queen Somaladevī records a grant made by the queen in favour of the Aruḷāla Perumāḷ temple when her husband was stationed at Abhinava-Vārāṇasī exactly as some of the king's own grants were made from his residence at the same city according to the Nagari plates. The Conjeeveram inscriptions therefore do not prove that the Gaṅga monarch ever encamped at Kāñchīpura.

The Conjeeveram inscriptions are dated in the regnal reckoning of the Cōḷa king Rājarāja III. This fact shows beyond doubt that the country around Conjeeveram was regarded as forming a part of the dominions of the Cōḷa king. If Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma III succeeded in conquering the above region, there would have been no question of referring to the years of the reign of a ruler who had been ousted. It appears that both Dr. Venkataramanayya and Dr. Mahalingam are conscious of this difficulty ; but their attempts to explain it away are most unconvincing. The former scholar speaks in this connection only of No. 444 of 1919, in which the name of the Cōḷa king finds no mention, and totally ignores No. 445 of 1919 which is clearly dated in the twentieth regnal year of Rājarāja III, although there cannot be any doubt that the two inscriptions are inseparably associated with each other. On the other hand, Dr. Mahalingam says: " Probably this visit of the Gaṅga king with his wife to Kāñchī had no political significance. Obviously they undertook only a pilgrimage tour to the city." He apparently forgets that this conjecture does not at all reconcile the dating at least of one of the Conjeeveram records clearly in the Cōḷa king's regnal reckoning with the Gaṅga conquest of the Tamil country,

There is evidence to show that Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma III was a saintly Vaiṣṇava. I have pointed out elsewhere [9] that this king,

9. *Journal of Orissa. Historical Research.* Vol. 1. Pp. 48–49.

according to a tradition of the *Mādalā Pāñjī* [10] became a ruler of the *Rāuta* or feudatory class after having dedicated all his possessions including the kingdom in favour of the god Purushottama-Jagannātha of Puri (*e nagara-Kaṭake thāi s'rī-Purushottama-s'rī-Jagannāthadevañku samasta samarpi Rāuta-pane thāānti*).' The same work also says how from that time the Gaṅga kings did not enjoy formal coronation at the time of their accession as they considered the god as the real ruler of their dominions (*Oḍis'ā-rājya-rajā s'rī-Jagannātha mahāprabhu emanta kahi abhiṣeka nohile*). I have also shown that Anaṅgabhīma III and his successors called themselves *Rāuta* (Sanskrit *Rājaputra*), that the kingdom of Anaṅgabhīma III is mentioned in one of his Bhuvaneswar inscriptions as the *Purushottama-sāmrājya* (*i.e.* Purushottama-Jagannātha's empire) and that in some records of Bhānu II (*circa* A. D. 1305-27) who was the great-great-grandson of Anaṅgabhīma III, the god Purushottama-Jagannātha (sometimes called *devādideva*) is mentioned as that king's overlord. The fact that the present Mahārājās of Puri, who are modern representatives of the medieval imperial rulers of Orissa, consider themselves servants of the god Purushottama-Jagannātha of Puri, no doubt shows the continuity of the belief first introduced by Anaṅgabhīma III by formally dedicating his kingdom to the god. An unpublished Bhuvaneswar inscription, recently examined by me, shows that the Vaiṣṇava king Anaṅgabhīma III was known even to his S'aiva officers as a *Bhagavat*. This shows that he was regarded by his subjects as a saint. It is, therefore, impossible to believe that this Vaiṣṇava king was responsible for the dislocation of worship at the Vaiṣṇava shrine of S'rīraṅgam when he was himself present in the Tamil country.

As regards the *oṭṭar*, with whom the priests of the S'rīraṅgam temple colluded to the detriment of the income of the temple about A. D.1224-25, it may be pointed out that the expression has been differently interpreted. Sri. Venkatasubba Ayyar [12]

10. A. B. Mahanti. *Op. Cit.* Pp. 26–27
11. *J. K. H. R. S.* Vol. I. Pp. 251–53.
12. *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXVII. P. 193. Note 4.

takes it to mean "those who have undertaken to do a thing or given an agreement (to the temple)." I have no doubt that Sri. Ayyar's interpretation of the word is correct.

The correct interpretation of the Conjeeveram inscriptions seems to be that Somaladevī, one the queens of Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma III *alias* Anantavarman was a Cōḷa princess, possibly a daughter or sister of Rājarāja III and that she was staying with her relatives in the Tamil country for some months in the nineteenth and twentieth years of the reign of the said Cōḷa king. During this stay, she twice visited the Aruḷāla Perumāḷ temple at Conjeeveram. She granted in favour of the deity, on the first occasion, a village called Udayakāma in Antarudra-viṣaya, probably situated in her own *jāgīr* in the dominions of her husband, while on the second occasion she made a grant in the god's favour in the name of her husband who was then residing at his capital at Abhinava-Vārāṇasī, *i.e.* Cuttack, in Orissa. The name of the queen may suggest that she was born of a princess of Kannaḍa origin. The grant of a village lying in one kingdom in favour of a deity in some other kingdom is known from other instances also. No. 154 of *S.I.I.* Vol. XI (Part II, Pp. 192 ff.) registers the gift of the village of Kanakāpura in Kundūr 500 (Dharwar District) for burning incense in the temple of Somanāthadeva of the Saurāṣṭra *viṣaya* (Kathiawar) by the Kadamba *Mahāmaṇḍales'vara* Jayakes'ideva at the time of his marriage under the direction of his father-in-law and overlord, Cāḷukya Vikramāditya VI (A. D. 1076-1126) of Kalyāṇa.

We do not believe that there is any evidence to justify us to think that Gaṅga Anaṅgabhīma III conquered the Tamil country and visited Conjeeveram.

Post Script :

After the preparation of this paper, based mainly on the notice of the Conjeeveram inscriptions in ***A.R.S.I.E.*** (***An. Rep. of the South Ind. Ep.***) the impressions of Nos. 444 and 445 of 1919-20 were available to me. The text of No. 444 clearly says that Somaladevī made the said grant when she was staying at Abhinava-Vārāṇavāsi

(*Abhinava-Vāraṇavsiyil iruṁdu*) during the nineteenth regnal year of Aṅantavarma-Rāhuta (*i.e.* Anaṅgabhīma III). This shows beyond doubt that Somaladevī, who was very probably a queen of the Gaṅga monarch, not to speak of the king himself, did not visit Kāñchī but made the grant from Abhinava-Vārāṇasī, *i.e.* the Gaṅga capital to be identified with the present Cuttack. An exactly similar case of a grant made by one in favour of a distant temple *in absentia*, among others, can be traced in *S.I.I.* Vol. VI, No. 1069, according to which Tallamadevī, queen of Gaṅga Bhāṇu IV, made a grant in favour of the god at Siṁhāchalam (Vishakhapatnam district) when she was staying at Vārāṇasī-Kaṭaka (*Vārāṇasī-Kāṭakāna nuṁḍi*) which is the same as Abhinava-Vārāṇavāsi or Abhinava-Vārāṇasī of the Conjeeveram inscription of Somaladevī, in S'aka 1344 (1422 A.D.). The mention of the Gaṅga king's regnal reckoning in Somaladevī's record appears to be due to the fact it was drafted at the Gaṅga capital.

SRIVILLIPUTTUR HISTORY AND EPIGRAPHY

By V. Srinivasan

Introduction

Srivilliputtur in the Rāmanāthapuram district of the Madras State is one of the holy places of the Vaiṣṇavas of South India. The region between the two seas, the Cape Comorin and Alagarmalai was formerly known as Pāṇḍyanādu and among the eighteen *Tirupatis* of this region S'rīvilliputtūr holds a prominent position as the birth-place of two of the twelve ālwārs or saints, namely, Periyālwār and his daughter, S'rī Āndāl, whose life-story is the theme of the famous Telugu work, *Āmukthamālyadā* or *Viṣṇucittīya*, writen by S'rī Krishnadeva Rāya of Vijayanagara. Āndāl's marriage with S'rī Raṅganātha traditionally linked S'rīvilliputtūr with S'rīraṅgam and the place is also the euphonym of Villiputtūrār of the Tamil Mahābhāratam. It is a place of considerable artistic interest with its temples dating from the times of the later Pāṇḍya and the Nāyaka rulers of Madurai and the region's latter day bead-roll of honour includes savants like L. Muthiah Bhagavathar, musician of repute and Dr. K. S. Krishnan, the eminent scientist. The town is the headquarters of the taluk of that name and could be reached by a three hours journey from Madurai by train or by car. In former days it was reputed to be a place of high strategic and military importance and the annals of such a centre of historic and artistic interest forms the subject of this study.

Origins: Traditional Accounts

Mahāviṣṇu is traditionally associated with the origins of S'rīvilliputtūr since the place is identified with the Varāhākṣetra of purāṇic times where the Lord assuming the form of a boar saved the much harassed world from the *asura*, Hiraṇyākṣa. This region was an *aranya* or forest, for aeons after that event, where famous ṛṣis like Bhṛgu and Mārkandēya performed penance.

Constrained once again to seek divine protection from the ravages of the *asura* Kālanēmi, the sages prayed the Lord on another occasion to come again to their succour. The Lord in pursuance of their prayer came down to the earth and destroyed the demon Kālanēmi. In response to the appeal of the sages to the Lord to stay with them the Lord took His abode in the *Campaka* forest reclining on the divine serpent, Ādis'ēṣa and on the *vata* leaf. The sthalapurāṇa mentions the place as Vatavēs'varapuram. Visitors are today shown the figures of Bhṛgu and Mārkaṇḍēya in the S'rī Vatapatrasayanar temple and there is a *Cakrat thālwār* shrine in the temple which is explained by the story of the Lord's vanquishing the *asura* and the Tirumukkulam tank is the Trivēni whither the God had the three holy rivers, Ganga, Yamuna and Sarasvatī brought together for cleansing the discus (*cakra*) he used in killing Kālanēmi.

Another interesting story of Varāhākṣetra is that of Mandūka ṛṣi or the frog-sage who is said to have attained oneness with the divine in this *kṣetra*. Sudapa, which is his original name, spent his early years at Alagarmalai in the devoted worship of God Soundararāja. One day ṛṣi Dūrvāsa visited his abode when Sudapa had gone out for his bath and ablutions. Ṛṣi Dūrvāsa feeling slighted at not having been honoured by a prompt reception laid a curse on the host, Sudapa, who accordingly assumed the form of a frog or *mandūka*. The frog-sage betook himself to Varāhā-keṣtra and regained his former human form after performing penance beside the Nūpuragaṇgā stream, when the god of Aḷagar-malai appeared before Sudapa in all his beatitude and agreed to stay there and afford facilities for regular worship. The jungle-stream is known as Mandūkanadi and there is a picturesque temple of Aḷagarsvāmi on the Mandūka malai cliff on the Western Ghat range behind the town.

The present name of the town is derived from Villi, a chieftain of the bowman clan who, with his brother, Kanta, ruled over the region many centuries ago. They were the sons of a village woman, Malli, by name and the present day village of Malli is probably known after her. During one of their hunts, a tiger decoyed

Kanta into a thicket where he was feared lost or killed but the despondent Villi was assured of his brother's safety by a voice, following which he found himself in the presence of the Lord. The lost brother of Villi was restored by divine grace and with the treasure they found in the tiger's larder the brothers erected habitations in the region and became the Romuus and Remus of S'rī-villiputtūr.'

The name of S'rīvilliputtūr thus consists of *S'rī* (Holy) in Sanskrit and *Villi* (bowman), *puttu* (new) and *ūr* (village) in Tamil and the full Sanskrit equivalent is S'rī Dhanvipura or S'rī Dhanuspura, meaning 'holy bowman town' and the place is also known as Gōdhāpuri or the town of Gōdha which is one of the names of S'rī Āndāl hereinafter to be mentioned.

S'rīvilliputtūr is one hundred and three miles north by east from Cape Comorin (Lat. 9° 30′ N. Long. 77° 37′ E)[1]. Vedapiran Bhattar's famous *vāzhit-tirunāmam* refers to the loveliness of the place in the following description :

> கோதை பிறந்தவூர் கோவிந்தன் வாழுமூர்
> சோதி மணிமாடம் தோன்றுமூர்—நீதியால்
> நல்ல பத்தர் வாழுமூர் நான்மறைக ளோதுமூர்
> வில்லிபுத்தூர் வேதக்கோனூர்.

The town is an old municipality with a population of over 40,000. It has passed through a period of acute drought in recent years but a scheme of protected water supply is now under execution. It is incidentally noticed in Sir Charles Lawson's account of the celebrations of the Jubilee of Queen Victoria in the Presidency of Madras that the public meeting held on February 16, 1887 in front of the Kalyāṇa Mantapam (when a similar drought was apparently being experienced) adopted a resolution recommending the diversion of a stream from the neighbouring mountains to be

1. *Imperial Gazetteer*. (1908). Vol. XXIII. P. 112. Or. Lat. 9° 35' N Long. 77° 49'E according to the old reckoning. *Cf.* Walter Hamilton *Geographical, Statistical and Historical Description of Hindoosthan and the Adjacent Countries*, 1820. Vol. II, P. 468.

called the "*Queen Empress Jubilee River.*" The place was then a Panchayat Board and had a population of 18,256.[2]

LIFE STORY OF PERIYALWAR AND SRI ANDAL. THE TIRUPPAVAI HYMNS. KRISHNADEVARAYA'S *Āmukthamālyadā* OR *Viṣṇucittīya*

The early history of S'rīvilliputtūr cannot be assigned to any definite date till we come to the period of the ālwārs. The fact that two of the ālwārs, namely, Periyālwār and his daughter S'ri Āndāl (the only lady among the twelve ālwārs) were born in S'rīvilliputtūr accounts for the celebrity of the place as a centre of pilgrimage and we should now turn to their life-story.

Periyālwār was born, according to the famous book of Vaiṣṇavite hagiology, the *Guruparampara Prabhāvam*, in the month of *Āni* and in the nature or *aṁsa* of Garuda in the forty-seventh year of the Kali age. He was the son of Mukundācārya, a Brāhmin of the *pūrvasika* sect and his wife was Padmavalli. He was first known as Viṣṇucitta because of his great devotion to the temple-deity, God Vatapatrasayanar, for whose daily worship the Brāhmin collected the required flowers from the *nandavanam* and made garlands to the deity.

S'aivism was then in the ascendant in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom and at God Vatapatrasayanar's instance and with His benediction, Viṣṇucitta availed himself of an opportunity afforded by the Madurai ruler to visit his court with a view to establishing Viṣṇu as the highest *tattva* to be meditated upon. Though the Brahmin was rather tremulous at the outset the arguments required for the occasion came to his mind like a flash through divine grace and he was able to over-come his diffidence thereby establishing that Nārāyaṇa was the *parātattva* deity. The bag of treasure tied to the cross beam of the palace gate which the Pāṇḍya ruler had offered as the reward for the winner in the contest came down of its own accord within his grasp. The Madurai court was thus initiated in 'The True Way.'

2. Sir Charles Lawson: *Narrative of the Celebration of the Jubilee of Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, Empress of India, in the Presidency of Madras* (2nd Edn, 1887). Pp. 170-171.

Viṣṇucitta was honoured and was taken in procession through the streets of Madurai on an elephant and he was hailed as the Bhattarpiran or the best of Brāhmins. Just then Viṣṇu appeared in the sky in all His glory on His *vāhana*, Garuda. Visṇucitta fearing that some evil eye in the crowd might injuriously affect the Lord's beautiful person began to bless Him to ward off the evil which was apprehended. In doing so he took the bells of the elephant and clanged them together, chanting at the same time the twelve Tamil verses that go by the name of *Tirup-pallāndu* with the refrain, "The blessings of many years to God."[3] "No ālwār before him or after him sang of long life to God and for the enduring Kingdom of God and His glory on this earth. This is one of the reasons why Viṣṇucitta was called Periyālwār (the Great Ālwār). He asked nothing for himself but prayed for God's eternal sovereignty on earth; the reason being that he was the foster-father of God." We echo Dr. K. C. Varadachari's tribute to Periyālwār as one of the most learned of the ālwārs.[4]

The *Tirupallāndu* hymns form the initial part of the collection of poems known as *Periyālwār Tirumozhi* which mostly deals with the exploits of S'rī Kṛṣṇa and includes the familiar verses known severally as *Neerāttam*, *Pūchūcttal* and *Kāppidal*, all dealing with S'rī Kṛṣṇa's boyhood. Viṣṇucitta is also considered to be the author of the *Kalpasūtra* commentary which is not now available, though S'rī Venkatanātha makes a mention of it in *Rahasyatrayasāra*.[5]

We turn to the next phase of Viṣṇucitta's life. One day, while working in the temple garden of S'rīvilliputtūr as was his wont, he found a female child under a *tuḷasi* (basil) plant in the ninety-eighth year of the Kali age. Taking her as God's gift he brought her up under the name of Kōthai or Gōdha and this foster-child became the famous Āṇdāl. The girl was an avatar

3. J.S.M. Hooper's *Hymns of the Ālvārs* has a good English version of the *Tiruppallāndu*. Vide Pp. 33-37 of that work in the *Heritage of India. Series* (Association Press. Calcutta).

4. Vide article on the Philosophy of Religion of the Ālwârs in the *Journal of the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute*, Tirupati. Vol, XI.P.88.

5. *Ibid.* P. 89.

of Viṣṇu's consort Bhūdevi and she grew in devotion to the God and believed herself as born to become His consort on earth. Her birth resembles the birth of Sītā, consort of S'rī Rāmachandra. The girl was born in the month of *Āḍi* under the asterism *pooram* or *pūrva phalguṇi*. Without the knowledge of her foster-father she used to bedeck herself with the garlands which Viṣṇucitta daily collected for the God and delighted herself to see her form on the placid water in the well and removing the garlands carefully, replaced them in the flower basket. This was being repeated often and one day Viṣṇucitta found her wearing the garland and became flabbergasted and after reprimanding her took a fresh garland to the shrine where, however, he had to explain his delay in coming when God Vatapatrasayanar assured him that the garland was more fragrant by a touch of his daughter, Gōdha. Thence onwards she came to be known as Sūdikkoduttha Nāchchiyār (சூடிக் கொடுத்த நாச்சியார்). Visitors are shown today the well-kept square *Kannāḍikkinar* or mirror-well wherein Gōdha is said to have seen her bedecked self. The tradition of God's wearing the garland after Āndāl wearing it, is still kept up in the daily worship and by the annual pratice of sending a big garland from Āndāl to S'rī Alagar of Tirumālirunjōlai or Alagarmalai to be worn by Him on the *Citrā Poornima* day when He comes to Madurai on his annual visit on the occasion of the great Mēṣamela.

Āndāl grew up in deep devotion to Viṣṇu and the *līlās* of S'rī Kṛṣṇa particularly appealed to her. Like the gopis of Vraja she desired to reach Him through some penance or *vrata* as prescribed for *Hemanta ṛtu* in the Bhāgavata purāṇa (Bk. X. Ch. 22). So she chose the month of *Mārgazhi* for her Kātyāyinī *vrata* and that month is even now considered sacred since the Lord of the Gīta has Himself enunciated his identity with Mārgas'īrsa as among his conspicious divine glories.[6]

---

6. बृहत्साम तथा साम्नां गायत्री छन्दसामहम्।
मासानां मार्गशीर्षोऽहमृतूनां कुसुमाकरः॥ (*Bhagavad Gītā, X. 35*)

"Likewise among the Sāma hymns, I am Brihatsāma ; among the various Vedic verses, I am the Gāyatri verse. *Among the months of the calendar I am Mārgas'īrsa* : among the seasons the vernal season."

This *vrata* was undertaken to secure social benefit and to reach S'rī Kṛṣṇa. Gōdha selected some sincere fellowmates of her age and all of them, every day, for one full month, offered prayers to the god after a ceremonial bath in the tank. Each day, Gōdha composed a poem meant for the occasion, thirty poems altogether. These are the famous *Tiruppāvai* verses the singing of which is ordained as part of the daily ritual in all the Viṣṇu temples under the *Pāncarātra sampradāya.* An interesting account of the Triuppāvai festival is given in Vidwan M. Raghava Aiyangar's *Ārāichchi Toghuti.*

Viṣṇucitta or Periyālwār as we should call him, later on, had a call from Lord S'rī Raṅganātha directing him to bring his daughter to S'rīraṅgam and give her in marriage to Him. This was the consummation devoutly wished for and when she was conducted to S'rī Raṅganātha's presence in his sanctuary she vanished from sight and the lady who had yearned for union with God thus had her wish fulfilled. She became S'rī Āndāl and the disconsolate Viṣṇucitta was assured by a voice divine that his daughter was in all bliss with S'rī Raṅganātha and that he himself was thenceforth *svaçura* or father-in-law. The Brahmin was filled with great wonder but prayed Lord Raṅganātha to go over to S'rīvilliputtūr and have the marriage celebrated there, with great splendour. The boon was granted. Periālwār returned back to S'rīvilliputtūr with his daughter and the marriage was accordingly celebrated in the month of *Panguni* under *uttiram* star, Lord Raṅganātha having gone there on that day on his *Garuda vahanam.* The Lord afterwards returned to S'rīraṅgam with her consort Gōdha and Periālwār returned to S'rivilliputtūr where he lived to the ripe old age of eighty-five. The one hundred and twelfth year of the Kali age is the traditional date of the wedding and the *Tirukalyāna Uttsava* is held every year on the *Panguni Uttiram* day.

The Āndāl temple which is said to have been erected by Periyālwār at the Lord's request, stands south of the Vatapatrasayanar temple and the principal shrine is that of Śrī Āndāl and Rengamannār which is the name by which S'rī Raṅganātha is known there. A noteworthy feature is that Garuda who brought

the divine bridegroom from S'rīrangam is given a place beside S'rī Āndāl and Rengamannār and so these three images stand together in this temple whereas Garuda is usually seen standing far away and opposite the *sannidhi* in all other Vaiṣṇava temples.

The *Tiruppallāndu* of Periyālwār and the *Tiruppāvai* of Āndāl are recited everyday in all the Vaiṣṇava temples of the peninsula and as the Lord is said to have enjoined Āndāl's worship as His own, a separate shrine for her is found in every Vaiṣṇava temple in South India.

The S'rī Nāchchiyār Dēvasthanam mainly derives its revenue from the extensive gardens known as Shenbaga Tope at the foot of the hills which are found to the west of the town. The Alagar shrine on the slope of the ghat range, which is reached by a well cut-out path commands a good prospect of woodland scenery of unsurpassed beauty and with its *mantapams* and with the perennial supply of water available in a pool there, it has become a favourite resort. Not far from this spot but higher up on the ghat range, we are shown the door-rock which is said to indicate the place where, according to one tradition, Āndāl disappeared after Her semi-divine existence in this world. There is also in the vicinity a frog-stone which is said to be covering a hollow in which Mandūka ṛṣi is believed to be still engaged in *tapas*. The pretty spots with small waterfalls which abound in the lower reaches of the hills attract picnic parties.

To the north of the town is the area of Venkatēsvarapuram, commonly known as Tiruvannāmalai, which stands on a high cliff with a fine temple of Venkatēṣa Perumāl at the top. The image of the god in this temple is very imposing and access to the shrine is easy because of the hundreds of well-cut steps and the temple affords the vantage of an excellent view of the surrounding country side. The white-washed temple of Lord Venkateṣa is thus the Dover cliff of S'rīvilliputtūr which the visitor espies even from a distance. There are several large *mantapams* in Venkatēsvarapuram and the *puskaraṇi* known as *Konēritheertham* is commemorated by the royal saint Kulas'ēkhara ālwār whose *vātsalya* for Viṣṇu led him to sing that he would be content to be reborn as a fish in the Konēri lake rather than as a king.

Though lying outside the municipal limits, Venkatēsvarapuram is within the public health jurisdiction of the municipality which is charged with the responsibility of making proper sanitary arrangements during the festival of Venkatēṣa Perumal which comes off in the month of *Purattāsi*. The Venkatēṣa and Alagar temples are managed by the S'rī Āndāl (Nāchchiar) Devās hanam which administers also the Rengathīrtham, another shrine in the neighbourhood. These are all familiar landmarks, particularly as the Madurai-Tenkasi trunk road passes through S'rīvilliputtūr and as Courtallam the famous spa of the south is only fifty miles away.

Periyālwār and Āndāl have contributed some 650 verses to the Prabhand four-thousand (நாலாயிர திவ்விய பிரபந்தம்)[7] forming no inconsiderable part of that famous collection which is known as the Drāvida Veda. (There is a tradition that Lord Viṣṇu had the prabhandam composed in Tamil to please the sage Agastya!) These verses are inspired by feelings of *bhaktimārga* as the path of salvation and the most important among them is, by universal consent, the *Tiruppāvai* which is described as *Upaniṣadsāram*. Āndāl composed these thirty idyllic verses as a part of *Sangattamil* and they are analogous to Saint Manickkavāsagar's *Tiruvēmbāvai* and a counterpart of the Jaina hymn-book also called *Tiruvēmbāvai*. The tradition of these poems is deeply ingrained in the peninsula most girls getting them by heart in their early years. During the Tiruppāvai-Tiruvēmbāvai festivities organised now under the anspices of H. H. S'rī S'aṅkaracarya of the Kamakōtipeetam the wide vogue of the festival is being brought home to the un-initated and it would also appear that in far-off Thailand (Siam) the government has been observing for a long-time since certain ceremonies known as Tiruppāvai-Tiruvēmbāvai.

The whole of *Tiruppāvai* partakes of the nature of choric songs and each verse ends with an invocation to Ṣ'rī. In the opening verse the singers profess confidence that they will obtain salvation and the verses that follow deal with the ceremony or

7. Periyālwār's *Tiruppallāndu* (12) and *Tirumozhi* (461) together with Āndāl's contribution of 173 (*Tiruppāvai*, 30 plus *Nâchchiyār Tirumozhi* 143) make 646 verses in all.

vrata and the results of its observance; after which we have a prayer addressed to Indra, the elemental god of rain. Verses 6 to 15 show the girls bathed and ready for the *vrata*, going from door to door and waking up those girls who have overslept themselves. The temple is reached in verse 16 and the next seven verses are concerned with requests that the temple, regarded as inhabited by S'rī Kṛṣṇa and his semi-divine associates, may be opened. Verses 24 to 29 are addressed to Viṣṇu in his various manifestations and the last stanza contains a formal mention of the author.

The great sage, Rāmānuja (1017-1137) who is also known as the Tiruppāvai Jeer, used to recite the *Tiruppāvai* hymns during his outings in S'rīraṅgam for *bhikṣa*. On reading S'rī Āndāl's declaration that she would place one hundred vessels of nectareous food before Soundararāja, the Lord of Alagarmalai (*Nachchiyār Tirumozhi*, IX, 6 & 7), he decided on carrying out her wish and journeying to the place, spread a great feast before the deity. He then proceeded to S'rīvilliputtūr and as he was standing before the goddess lost in devotion she conferred upon him the title of *Kōvilannār*, through the medium of the priest on duty.[8]

Bhattar too was captivated by the idyllic charm of the *Tiruppāvai* verses and Venkatanātha better known as Vedānta Dēs'ika wrote *Gōdhāstuti* in praise of S'rī Āndāl.

Kambar (1145-1205) made the gift of an ornament to her shrine—it is worn by the goddess during the *mārgazhi* festival—and a photo of it was appropriately on view in the Rajaji Hall in the Government House Estate, Mount Road, Madras, as it was secured for the exhibition held in connection with the Kamban festival when that festival was celebrated in Madras last time.

Such has been the glory of Āndāl and her *Tiruppāvai*. To her glory we should add that of Periyālwār. The *Kṛṣṇaprema* of both was unbounded and this devotion has verily enriched the

8. Alkondaville Govindacharya: *Life of Rāmānujacārya*. Ch. XXXII. Pp.210-211.

literature of mysticism.[9] We may refer, *en passant* to the following reference to Periyālwār in Periyajeeyar's *Upadēsaratna-mālai.*

> "மங்களாசாசனத்தின் மற்றுள்ள ஆழ்வார்கள்
> தங்களார் வத்தளவுதானன்றி—பொங்கும்
> பரிவாலே, வில்லிபுத்தூர்ப் பட்டர்பிரான் பெற்றான்
> பெரியாழ்வாரென்னும் பெயர் (18-வது பாசுரம்)."

The annual festivals for God Vatapatrasayanar (*Furattāsi*), and S'rī Āndāl (*Ādi Pooram, Mārgazhi Neerāttam, Panguṇi Uttiram*) are big events attracting pilgrims all over the land. The fifth-day festival of the *Ādi utsavam* is particularly grand as the *utsavamūrthis* of five gods, Vatapatrasāyi, Venkatēṣa, Tiruttangāl Appan, Alagar and Rengamannār are taken in procession on *Garudavāhanams* with S'rī Āndāl on a *haṁsa.* On the seventh day of this festival Āndāl and Rengamannār are taken to the Kṛṣṇa temple which will be mentioned below and on the last day of the festival *i.e.* the *Pooram* day they are placed on a massive car (*tirutthē*) which is considered to be the largest in the country, weighing over one hundred and fifty tons and the car-dragging sometimes takes many days to be completed, after which the god and the goddess will be taken to the *mantapam* in the *nandavanam* between the two temples, where Āndāl was born. The picturesque *Mārgazhi festival* held in Aghram when the sun is in Sagittarius is only for Āndāl who is taken every day to the Ennaiykkāppu or Thailakkāppu *mantapam* on the west bank of the Tirumukkulam tank and the festival concludes on the *Makhara Sankarānthi* day, with a visit to the S'rī Manavāzhamāmunigal shrine in the long stone corridor in front of the Nachchiyār temple, after which Āndāl is taken into the sanctum to join Rengamannār. The *Tirukkalyāna Uttsava* in the month of *Panguni* is also an impressive festival lasting for nine days and Āndāl and Rengamannār, on the last day, are taken through the car streets on a gaily constructed *ratham.* Other picturesque

---

9. *Vide.* In this connection, P. N. Srinivasacharya: *The Philosophy of Vis'iṣtādvaita.* Adyar Library, 1943. Pp. 455-456.

festivals for Āndāl are the *Navarātri* festival before the Vijaya-dasami day, the rocking festival and the two vernal festivals of the *Chitrai* (*chaitar*) and *Vaikāsi* (*Baisākh*) months and the *adhyayana uttsava* about *Svargavasil* or *Vaikuntha Ekādasi* day. General interest also lies in the weekly function on every Friday evening when Āndāl and S'rī Rengamannār hold Court in the gilded *mantapam* just in front of the sanctum and the mirror-well already referred to which is very close to this "*sukravāra man-tapam.*"

There are separate shrines for God Narasimha and for Nammālwār, Periyālwār, Rāmānuja, Kooratthālwār, Desikar and others and festivals held in them and in the Krṣṇa and S'rinivasa perumal shrines are always well-attended, as also the *Brahmōtsava* of S'rī Vatapatrasayanar. The Nachchiyār devasthanam has considerable jewellery and the usual complement of elephants, horses and camels. The posts of elephant mahouts have been generally held by Moslems which bespeaks of the spirit of communal harmony prevailing in the place.

There are two mosques in the town and the Carnātic Nawābs have endowed not only the mosque but the Āndāl temple, the management of which have to this day borne the expenses of burning a lamp in the *maharab* of one of the mosques in the town.

Reference is made in Periyālwār's works to a Pāṇḍyan king, Nedu Tēr Māran Vallabha Dēva who set the seal of fish on the Himālaya mountain and Dr. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar was inclined to identify him with a ruler of that name occurring second in the genealogical tables in the Velvikudi grant described by the Government Epigraphist in 1906.[10] Periyālwār's Māran has also been identified with the above ruler's grandson of that name who was a contemporary of Gñānasambandar. The last stanza of *Tiruppallāndu* has a reference to Selvanambi, an important

10. See his *Early History of Vaishnavism in South India*, Pp. 87-88, (Also *The Beginnings of South Indian History* by the same author, at P. 258 *et sqq.*) The traditional date for Periyālwār is the forty-seventh year of the Kali Age. See T. A. Gopinatha Rao: *History of the Sri Vaishnavas* P. 5.

functionary at the Pāṇḍyan court, probably a priest, at whose suggestion the *majlis* might have been organised where Viṣṇucitta won his victory.

The story of this ālwār and his daughter has been commemorated by the great king Krishna Dēva Rāya of Vijayanagara (1509-1530) as it was the theme of his work, *Āmukthamālyadā* or *Viṣṇucittīya* which is acclaimed as the greatest classic in Telugu literature. That S'rīvilliputtūr was among the places visited by the Rāya is inferred from the *Rāyavāchakamu* an account of his campaigns prepared for Viswanātha Nāyaka, son of general Nāgama, by an agent of *Viswa's* at the headquarter.[11] The king had previously written much in delicious Sanskrit but while visiting the *Āndhra Madhusūdana* temple in the ancient capital town of S'rī-Kākulam for worship on an *Ekādasi* day he had a dream through which he was directed by divine will to write a work in Telugu which was then the *des'īya-bhāṣa* and the theme selected was the story of Viṣṇucitta and Āndāl. This direction was duly complied with by the writing of the *kāvya* in five cantos and the work was dedicated to lord Venktēsvara of Tirupati as instructed by divine command. There has been some controversy over the authorship of the work but it has been established that the tradition about its royal authorship is correct and it was composed by the king and not by *Allasāni Peddana.*[12] This *kāvya* is said to have introduced for the first time the Vaiṣṇava influence into Telugu literature. Despite the style being somewhat complicated and the diction difficult, the work appears to hold out a rich reward for the persevering student as it throws abundant light on the customs, religious beliefs and social life of a bygone day. We learn, for instance, that palanquins were used in transport only by eminent personages like rulers and by men who were considered to be worthy of equal respect, that Viṣṇucitta travelled from S'rīvilliputtūr to Madurai in a palanquin or *andaḷam* placed at his disposal by one of the *sthanikas* or trustees of the temple and that he used a hired horse too for the carrying of his effects and

---

11. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar: *Sources of Vijayanagara History* P. 117.

12. C. Hayavadana Rao: *Mysore Gazetteer.* Vol. II. Part III at Pp. 1922-1924 where the matter is discussed at some length.

also took sweets and condiments for his food *en route* in a *kāvadi.*[13] These are interesting details and the literary merits of *Āmukthamālyadā* are also great. "There is hardly a book in Telugu," writes Messrs. Chenciah and Raja Bhujanga Rao,[14]

---

13. *Āmukthāmalyadá,* (2: 95-97) *Cf.* N. Venkataramanayya: *Studies in the History of the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagara,* Pp. 330, 335, 341 and 343 and note.

14. P. 71, *A History of Telugu Literature* by P. Chenciah and Raja M. Bhujanga Rao Bahadur, (The Heritage of India Series) Vide *Journal of Indian History.* Vol. VI, 1927 for translation of *Āmukthamàldyadà* by Mr. A. Rangasami Sarasvati. A writer in Telugu who produced a translation of the *Thiruppàvai* hymns was Muddu Palani, a noted poetess who lived at Tanjavūr about 1765. She was a courtesan in the harem of Pratapasimha and was the author of a *kāvya* entitled *Ràdhikà Svantvam.* She translated *Tiruppāvai* into felicitous Telugu and with great fidelity. But only the first ten of the thirty stanzas are said to be extant. Pandit Kurathalwar Iyengar of St. Josephs College. Tiruchchirappalli appended a Telugu translation of the hymns to his little work *Āndāl Thirukkalyànamu* and I should mention among others Tiruppâvai according to the Ārāiyirappadi and Eerāyirappadi edited in Telugu by Venkatacharya and Tiruvenkatacharya. The Dwaraknāth Sewak Mandal which has been interesting itself in the propagation of Vis'is'tādvaita philosophy in the Telugu country has held several competitions and awarded prizes and medals for translations of *Tiruppāvai.*

For English translations see *Indian Antiquary* Vol. LV (Sep. 1926) at Pp. 161-167 where the whole of *Tiruppāvai* is rendered into English. Also J. S. M. Hooper. *Hymns of the Ālvàrs,* Pp. 50-57. *Poems by Indian Women* is the title of a little anthology published under Margaret Macnicol's editorship in the same series as Hooper's book belongs to and contains English renderings of seven stanzas by Miss Abraham and the Rev. J. S. Masilamani. B. D. Madurai (*Vide* Selections XLIII. XLV. XLVI. XLVIII. L. LII and LV. at Pp. 60-65.) In the edition consulted by me the Word *Tirumozhi* (*i.e.* Nachchiyar Tirumozhi) has been transliterated wrongly in the Introduction as *Tiruvàimalai,*

Besides these English renderings we have a satisfying translation by Mr. D. Ramaswamy Iyengar published by the Teachers Publishing House, Madras (1946) which has the advantage of an instructive introduction on the *Tiruppâvai* besides an excursus on the esoteric meaning of the poem.

The authorities of the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams at Tirupati have recently brought out an excellent pictorial edition of *Tiruppàvai* with

"where there is such a continous flow of ideas seeking an impetuous outlet in language, which though rich, is yet scarcely equal to the task of full and adequate expression. For insight into human nature and for facility in depicting elusive moods by some striking phrase Krishna Dēva Rāya has no superior or scarcely an equal."

(*To be continued*)

---

a valuable indtroduction and explanatory notes in Tamil by the eminent litterateur Mr. P. Sri Acharya. Each of the thirty poems has a tricolour picture to illustrate it and the fine frontispiece of S'rī Āndàl greatly enhances the value of this delightful publication which is appropriately entitled *Chittira Tiruppāvai* (சித்திரத்திருப்பாவை).

THE CHRONOLOGY OF ANDHRA DYNASTY AND THE HATHIGUMPHA INSCRIPTION

By Y. V. Ramana Rao, M.A., B.L.

It may not be mere commonplace rhetoric to compare several schemes of chronology of dynasties of rulers in the early history of India to houses of cards which may utterly collapse at the next major archæological or numismatic discovery. At any rate such comparison may in a large measure hold good particularly in regard to the various solutions concerning the problem of chronology of the line of thirty kings known as the Āndhras or Āndhrabhṛtyās or S'ātavāhanas who held sway over the greater part of the Indian peninsula in the early centuries before the Christian era. The reason is not far to seek. As the data so far available are extremely scanty and illusory, it is hardly feasible for any one to construct a scheme of chronology which is proof against any kind of criticism which is or even generally acceptable.

Materials Scanty

Even in 1953 the work of historical research in the S'ātavāhana dominions is in the nascent stage. For, materials, literary, epigraphic, numismatic or archæological, are distressingly meagre. Jaina and Pāli sources have not been tapped. Local traditions and legends have yet to be gathered and sifted and South Indian recensions of the purāṇas still remain sealed books. Ancient historic sites in the S'ātavāhna area await systematic expert exploration and excavation. The archæological department of the State of Hyderabad appears to have just commenced its work near Paithan and its environs and the departmental programme and its results are yet officially unknown. Till the present day, for a dynasty of thirty kings only twenty-four epigraphs (many of which are neither informatory nor illuminative) have been the staple pabulam of the students of the S'ātavāhana period and, strangely enough, all these records relate only to nine kings. Numismatic evidence, not always of a conclusive or clarifying nature, is confined to eleven members of the dynasty. Cimmerian darkness envelops nineteen out of thirty kings. Conflicting, baffling and elusive purāṇas constitute

the mainstay of any hard-headed worker whose lot is to plough the lonely sands of the S'ātavāhana period. Therefore, it is no wonder that no accepted scheme of chronology has yet been devised for this dynasty. Perhaps such a day is not likely to dawn unless and until evidence of a startling character is discovered.

Some Extant Schemes

Indeed the same ground accounts for the amazingly wide divergence of views among scholars. For, the tentative initial date of the first king of the dynasty ranges from 270 B.C. to 38 B.C. and the date of the close of the reign of the last sovereign varies from 189 A.D. to 300 A.D. The diversity of views may be illustrated by the dozen schemes which are succinctly set out below:

Although Messrs. Hari Charan Ghose and G. Bose have not expressly propounded schemes of chronology of their own from the discussion of the subject and the detailed views expressed by them in connection therewith, it is quite possible to construct their schemes in outline.

Mr. Hemachandra Rayachaudhuri: 38 B.C. to 300 A.D.[1]
Sir R. G. Bhandarkar: 72 B.C. to 218 A.D.[2]
Sir V. A. Smith: 240 (230) B.C. to 225 A.D.[3]
E. J. Rapson: 219 B.C. to 249 A.D.[4]
Lionel D. Barnett: 220 B.C. to 236 A.D.[5]
R. Sewell: 220 B.C. to 222 A.D.[6]
C. Hayavadana Rao: 232 B.C. to 218 A.D.[7]
K. Gopalachari: 234 B.C. to 207 A.D.[8]
K. R. Subramanyam: 225 B.C. to 225 A.D.[9]

1. *Political History of Ancient India*. 1932.
2. *Early History of the Deccan*. 1884. Section VI.
3. *Early History of India*, Fourth Edition.
4. *A Catalogue of Coins in the British Museum*, 1908, P. XVII, XXVII & XLIV.
5. *Antiquities of India*, Pages 40 and 45.
6. *Historical Inscriptions of Southern India*, 1930. Pp. 324-325.
7. *Mysore Gazetteer*, 1930. Volume II, Part II, Pp. 487-488.
8. *Early History of the Āndhra Country*. Pp. 28-29.
9. *Buddhist Remains in Āndhra*, 1932, P. 8.

Hari Charan Ghose: [10]

G. Bose: [11]

G. Venkat Rao: 370 B.C. to 189 A.D.[12]

It is evident from a cursory glance at the above interesting statement that early writers like Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar placed the beginning of the dynasty in the first century before Christ, while later writers assigned it either to the early or late decades of the third century B.C. It requires a bulky monograph to set out at length the views of all the writers on the subject and to scan their schemes closely and to embark on a reasoned and constructive criticism of all the extant schemes. The object of this article is to notice briefly the earliest and latest theories and then to set out a new working theory on the basis of the accessible data.

BHANDARKAR'S SCHEME

The earliest pioneer who worked in this lonely region in the early nineties of the last century and who ventured to piece together all the then available scattered scraps of evidence culled from literature, inscriptions and coins and to build for his work "*Early History of the Deccan*, 1884" a tasselled chronological framework for the Āndhrabhṛtya dynasty, was the late Sir R. G. Bhandarkar. His resourcefulness merits praise, if we bear in mind the fact that Pargiter's "*Purāṇic Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*" (1913) with its critical apparatus of variants appeared about thirty years later. The manner in which Bhandarkar in the early nineties of the last century tackled this difficult problem is exceedingly interesting and well-worth study. He called to his aid a contemporary foreign account containing a reference to a S'ātavāhana sovereign and the inscriptional evidence relating to a neighbouring S'aka king. The few inscriptions of the S'ātavāhanas contain regnal years and do not refer to any known era. But the inscriptions of the S'aka kings refer to what is generally accepted to be the S'aka era. In his work entitled "*Geography*," Ptolemy, the Greek geographer who lived at Alexandria (139-171 A.D.) states that

10. *I. H. Q.* 1930. Vol. VI. P. 753; 1931. Vol. VII. Pp. 117-124.
11. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.* 1939. Pp. 1-131.
12. *Journal of Indian History*. Vol. XXVII. Part III. Decr. 1949. Pp. 243-252.

Siri Polomeis reigned over the northern portion of the west coast of India and that Baleocuros who lived in Hippocura, ruled over its southern portion. He identified Siri Polomeis with the twenty-fourth king in the list of the S'ātavāhana dynasty in the Matsya purāṇa. He inferred that he and his father ruled the kingdom conjointly and drove the S'aka foreigners from the Deccan. As the dates of Nahapana and Rudradaman are known from their inscriptions, Bhandarkar strove to fix the dates of their contemporary S'ātavāhana rulers, namely, Pulumāvi and his father Gautamīputra. After establishing a synchronism between the above S'ātavāhana kings and their contemporary Kṣatrapa rulers, he sought to fit in these synchronistic dates with the chronology of Āndhra kings as outlined in the purāṇas. As his scheme collided with that of the purāṇas, he had to subject the purāṇic genealogy of the Āndhra dynasty to a drastic process of procrustean excision. Starting with the date of Chandragupta the "sheet anchor of Indian chronology," he examined the periods of duration of the Maurya (322 B. C.), the Suṅga (185 B. C.) and the Kanva (73 B. C.) dynasties (137 plus 112 plus 45). The account of Ptolemy and an independent examination of relevant coins and inscriptions of the S'ātavāhanas led him to infer that the Āndhra empire must have been divided and been under the control of two branches of the S'ātavāhana dynasty that its main branch reigned at Dharnikota in the Guntur district and that the minor branch ruled at Paithan in the Hyderabad State and that another branch ruled over Kuṅtala. He also observed that the account in the Matsya purāṇa was fuller but that the version in the Vāyu purāṇa was older and that the Matsya purāṇa included an account of the main and minor branches of the dynasty, while the list of kings in the Vāyu purāṇa was confined only to the main branch. Therefore he excluded the duration of the reigns of the kings of the minor branch of the S'ātavāhana dynasty at Paithan. As he found that the Kanvas were coeval with the Suṅgas, he ignored the period of the Suṅga dynasty and fixed 73 B. C. as the date of the beginning of the Āndhrabhṛtya dynasty. He considered that the duration of the dynasty was probably about three centuries (73 B. C. to 218 A. D.). If the Āndhra dynasty had been

founded in 73 B. C. and if the account in the Vāyu purāṇa should be taken to refer to the main branch of the dynasty, the accession of Gautamīputra must be placed in 133 A. D. and he must have ceased to reign in 154 A. D. According to the duration of the reigns of his successors in the Vāyu purāṇa, the close of the reign of the last king must be placed in 218 A. D.

Rapson's Scheme

The method of investigation adopted by V. A. Smith and E. J. Rapson in substance resembles that of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar but the manner of its immediate approach to the problem is exceedingly ingenious and distinctly better. Bhandarkar sought to prove a point of contact between one of the later members of the S'ātavāhana dynasty and a contemporary member of the Western Kṣatrapa line of kings: and with the aid of the genealogy of the S'ātavāhana dynasty as evolved by him from the purāṇic materials, he worked backwards and fixed the initial date of the dynasty. But his English compeers sought to establish a two-fold point of synchronistic contact, one at the outset and the other towards the end, of the dynasty. The first synchronistic contact relates to the early members, while the second synchronistic contact pertains to the later members, of the dynasty. Doubtless, like Bhandarkar they examined for themselves the conflicting dynastic genealogies in the purāṇas, collected discrepant readings in various copies of the manuscript of the same purāṇa and settled in their own way the text in these purāṇas in respect of the names of members of the dynasty, the order of their succession and the duration of the reign of each member of the dynasty. While Bhandarkar ultimately depended on the text of the Vāyu purāṇa, they preferred the text of the Matsya purāṇa. It is necessary to bear in mind the fact that each of these English scholars had to do this taxing work of collecting all manuscripts within their reach long before Pargiter undertook the task of settling the purāṇa text at the instance of Dr. Fleet and saved all future workers from further similar drudgery. With the help of the synchronism between Kharavela, B. C. 170 and S'ātakarṇi the third member of the dynasty, Rapson fixed the date of the first member. After proving the contact

between Rudradaman and Pulumāvi, he fixed the end of the dynasty. While Bhandarkar's edifice has only one base, Rapson's structure has two bases. The first base relates to the early members of the dynasty and seeks to forge a contact between a member of the Chedi dynasty and that of the S'ātavāhana dynasty.

KHARAVELA'S INSCRIPTION AND THE FIRST CONTACT OF SYNCHRONISTIC PRONG

On the basis of the text of the inscription "*Muriya Kale Vochine Ca Coyathe Agesati Ku Tariyam Capadayati*" published and interpreted by Bhagavanlal Indraji in 1823,[13] Rapson states that the inscription is "dated in the one hundred and sixty-fifth year (current) of the era of the Mauryan kings, and the thirteenth year of Kharavela's reign," that the Maurya era dates probably from the coronation of Chandragupta (*Circa* 321 B.C.) and that the date of Karavela's accession must be *Circa* 170 B.C. As the father and grandfather of Kharavela, Vṛddharāja and Kṣemarāja are mentioned in the inscription, Kharavela would seem to have been the third member of the Chedi dynasty. The S'ātakarṇi mentioned in the inscription and associated with Kharavela in the second year of his reign (168 B.C.) was probably the third member of the dynasty.

SECOND CONTACT OF SYNCHRONISTIC PRONG

After fixing thus the beginning of the S'ātavāhana dynasty, Rapson proceeded to determine the period of its end. According to Rapson the testimony of coins tends to show that the end of the Āndhra dominion in Kuṅtala is to be traced to the first half of the third century A.D., in the Mahārāṣṭra in 249 A.D. and in the Āndhradēṣa in the third century A. D. before the accession of the Pallavas to the throne of Vengi.[14] He states that at present the whole foundation of the later Āndhra chronology rests on the synchronism between the known date 72=150 A. D. of Rudrādaman as Mahākṣatrapa and the recorded regnal dates in the inscriptions of other Āndhra sovereigns.[15] He assumes that the years in the inscriptions

13. Rapson. *Op. Cit.* P. XVII.
14. *Ibid.* Introduction, P. XLIV.
15. *Ibid.* P. XXVII.

of the western Kṣatrapas are dated in the S'aka era and he is supported by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar[16] and H. C. Rayachaudhury.[17] and D. R. Bhandarkar.[18] But his assumption is disputed by Neelakanta Sastri,[19] Dubreuil[20] and Bhakhle[21] who contend that the inscriptions must be referred to the Vikrama era. It is contended that a number of events, the fall of Nahapana, the defeat of Goutamīputra by Chasthana, the annexation of Kathiawar, Gujarat and Malwa by Chasthana, the conjoint rule of Chasthana and his son Jayadaman and his grandson Rudradaman must be compressed within a very short period.[22] Although some of these objections urged against the theory of Rapson may not be without some point or force, no conclusive grounds have been urged against it. Moreover, the other theory also is not free from objections or doubt. Therefore the theory of Rapson must be deemed to hold the field, till clinching evidence to the contrary is forthcoming.

DATE OF KHARAVELA'S ACCESSION

Though it may not be feasible to be confident about the correctness of the final text of the inscription of Kharavela owing to the ravages of time and the weather, the view of K. P. Jayaswal who devoted great attention for a long period to the decipherment, restoration and interpretation of this enigmatic epigraph, is entitled to weight. K. P. Jayaswal and R. D. Banergea have shown that the inscription does not contain any reference to the Mauryan era. The relevant text as settled by them runs as follows :

> " *Muriya Kala Vochinam ca cayathi*
> *anga-satika* (*m*) *turiyam upadayati* "

(causes to be completed the eleven Angas of the sixty-four letters which had become lost with the time of the Mauryas). As the date of Kharavela's accession was determined by Rapson on the

16. R. G. Bhandarkar. *Op. Cit.*
17. H. C. Rayachaudhury, *Op. Cit.*
18. D. A. Bhandarkar : *J.B.B.R.A.S.* Vol. XXX. III.
19. Neelakantha Sastry : *J. R. A. S.* 1926. P. 643. Ff.
20. G. Jouveau Dubreuil : *Ancient History of Deccan*, P. 35.
21. Bhakle : *J. B. B. R. A. S.* 1927. Vol. III P. 66.
22. V. R. Deoras : *Proc. Ind. Hist. Congress*, 1940. P. 152.

basic assumption that the epigraph embodied a reference to the Mauryan era and as the assumption has been shown to lack any foundation, the date adopted by Rapson obviously requires revision. An attempt has been made to seek for a fresh basis. It is stated in the Haṭhigumpa inscription that Kharavela in the twelfth year of his reign compelled Brihaspatimitra (Bahasapatimita)[23] the king of Magadha "to bow at his feet." Kharavela is taken to be a contemporary of Puṣyamitra, who founded the Sungamiṭra dynasty and who ascended the throne in 188 B. C. Brihaspatimitra is mentioned in the *Sankhyāyana Gṛhya Sūtra* (1.23.6) as the presiding deity of the *Puṣya* constellation of stars. On the basis of this synchronism between Kharavela and Puṣyamitra, the accession of king Kharavela is assigned to 182 B.C. "*Nandarāja tivāsasata Oghatita*" should be interpreted as "opened out in 300 Nanda era.[24] It has been shown that the terms "Vṛddharāja" and "Kṣemarāja" are epithets qualifying Kharavela but not the names of the father and grandfather of Kharavela. (*Khema-rajā sa* (,) *Vadha-rāja sa* (,) (*Imda*)—*rāja sa* (,) *Dhama-rāja pasamto sunamto anubhavamto kalanani—Guna—visesa—kusalo* etc.[25] "He who was the lord of security, he who was the lord of bounty, he who was like Inda-rāja, the lord of power, (he who was) like Dhamma-rāja, the lord of justice, perceiving, hearing and experiencing the things that are conducive to welfare, etc."[26] It is also assumed that the Chedi dynasty of Kaliṅgas arose simultaneously with the dynasty of the Āndhras in the Krishna-Godavari basin and that Kharavela, the third member of the Chedi dynasty was a contemporary of S'ātakarṇi I, the third member of the Āndhra dynasty. The epigraph mentions the fact that Kharavela in the fifth year of his reign facilitated communication by effecting an extension of the old canal which was opened out so as to lead it into the capital city from the Tanasuliya road. The time of such extension is indicated by the words "*Nandarāja*

23. *J. B. & O. R. S.* Vol. III, Pp. IV. Pp. 477-478.
24. *Ibid.* P. 240.
25. B. Barua, Old Brahmi Inscriptions P. 29.
26. *Ibid.* P. 46.

Tivasa-Sata Oghatita" which are interpreted as "opened out by king Nanda 103 (303) years ago," or as "opened out in 300 Nanda era" (the era founded by king Nandavardhana, the grandfather of Mahāpadma Nanda in 485 B.C.). In support of the existence of the era two facts are cited. Alberuni who wrote his Indica in 1030 A. D. found this era in actual use in Mathura and Kanauj. It is also evidenced by the Vedarava inscription of the Cāḷukya king, Vikramāditya VI.

(*To be concluded.*)

SRI VENKATESWARA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE
TIRUPATI.

Publishes a series of original Sanskrit, Telugu, and Tamil works with commentaries and translations and also a series of studies on different subjects by the members of the Institute.

Also publishes a Journal containing Research articles by the staff of the Institute.

Forty Volumes in the Series and **Six** Volumes in the Studies and **Twelve** Volumes of Journals have been published up-to-date.

For particulars please apply to the General Editor :—

PROF. SRI P. V. RAMANUJASWAMI, M.A.,

Director, Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute,

Tirupati, Chittoor District (Dakshina Bharath).

A CORONATION 4,000 YEARS AGO

By F. R. Sell

When the Āryans were settled in the Punjab (about 2,000 B. C.) they were organised by tribes and clans. The tribes were ruled by kings or chieftains with the advice of a council and probably, also of the purohit or family priest.

This article will give the reader some idea of how they set about crowning, or rather we should say, anointing a new king. It will describe only the essential part of the ritual occupying a few hours on one special day in the middle of very long-drawn-out sacrifices.

A special ground on the bank of a river was made ready to which spectators flocked in their thousands. There they waited for the ceremony of anointing the young prince, enjoying the fun provided to amuse them during the intervals of the ceremonial or other periods of waiting. Singers, dancers, acrobats displayed their skill.

The King-Elect

A Sudden silence fell. The purohit, or family priest, was seen leading the king-elect towards a beautiful tiger skin that he had previously stretched out on the ground where four wooden bowls of liquids of various kinds had been placed. The prince was then made to put on a cotton cloth soaked in ghee round his waist, a red blanket over his body and a cloak over that. Red was an auspicious colour. A Turban was then put on his head. A bow ready-strung was handed to him together with three arrows. All these actions were accompanied by suitable phrases.

Thus clothed and thus armed, the prince announced himself in a clear voice to all the gods whose protection he prayed for. The priest meanwhile put a piece of red metal in the mouth of a long-haired man sitting nearby in order, by a kind of magic, to prevent evil from approaching.

Monarch of the Earth

Then the prince was made to take four steps, one each towards east, north, south and west, to show everybody that he was monarch of all the region of the earth.

After that he kicked away from a corner of the tiger skin a piece of copper lying there, as a sign that he had driven off a certain evil demon. Then he was led on to the tiger skin, a plate of gold was placed under his feet and another, pierced with nine holes, on his head. This gold symbolised immortal life.

With arms uplifted and face turned towards the east, the prince was anointed or rather sprinkled, with the liquids in the four wooden bowls.

A priest poured some on his head, a nobleman besprinkled his right side, a man of the tribe his back and a near kinsman his left side. The horn of a black antelope was handed to him and with this he spread the life-giving water all over himself.

A Mimic Raid

Then followed a mimic raid on an enemy's cattle. A three-horsed chariot was brought to him in which he took his seat. When it had been driven in amongst a herd of cattle, the new king touched one of them with the tip of his bow. This was a sign that he had successfully captured his enemy's chief property.

Taken back to his former place he slipped his feet into boar's skin sandals—the boar being symbolical of courage—and stepped down from the chariot, which was driven off.

He was then, after giving gifts of silver and gold to the priest, led to a throne seat placed on the tiger skin and caused to sit down upon it. The priest and his assistants gently beat him on the back with sticks to prevent him ever again receiving punishment. Words of praise and homage were thereafter spoken by the priests who had now, after the symbolic beating, taken their seats round him.

Lucky and All-Powerful

After this, a wooden sword was given to him to be handed over by him to the Keeper of the Dice, who scraped smooth a place

in the sand to serve as a board for the formal game of dice. The king, of course, was made to cast the winning throw and so to defeat the other players, one taken from each class of his people. This showed that the new king was lucky and all-powerful.

The special ceremony was then brought to an end by a recital of ancient legend and by the congratulations and homage of the king's allies, tributaries, vassals and other guests.

(From *St. Peter's Parochial Review*, March 1953.)

Critical Edition of the Valmiki Ramayana

We are happy to inform our readers that the Oriental Institute, Baroda, have undertaken the publication of the Critical Edition of the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki exactly on the lines of the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata now published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

Libraries, Institutions and individuals possessing any manuscripts of the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa are requested to correspond with the Director, Oriental Institute, Baroda.

EDITOR.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE JAVANTINATHAPURAM INSCRIPTION OF VARAGUNA

IN an article recently contributed to the *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*,[1] Sri. K. S. Vaidyanathan has levelled certain criticisms against my interpretaion of the contents of an inscription of Pāṇḍya Varaguṇa Mahārāja at Javantināthapuram, Lālgudi taluk, Tiruchchirāppaḷḷi district.[2] Without taking any serious note of his invective[3] I shall confine myself to the points in dispute of which the following three are the main :

I. Ascription of three records containing astronomical details to the reign of the Pāṇḍya king Varaguṇa-Mahārāja II in preference to that of Varaguṇa-Mahārāja I.

II. Date of accession of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla.

III. Date of the final conquest of the Pallava country and its annexation by the Cōḷas.

ASCRIPTION OF THREE RECORDS TO VARAGUNA-MAHARAJA II

Inscription	*Date quoted in it*	*Its English equivalent according to me.*
Javantināthapuram inscription (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXVIII, P. 39.)	4+9th year, *Dhanus*, Monday, *Aviṭṭam*	= Monday, December 5, 875 A. C.
Lālguḍi inscription B. (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. XX. P. 52-3.)	4+9th year, *Dhanus*, Tuesday, *S'adaiyam*	= Tuesday, December 6, 875 A. C.
Tiruveḷḷaṟai inscription (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. XI. P. 253.)	4+9th year, *Vṛiścika*, Monday, *As'vati*.	= Monday, November 14, 875 A. C.[4]

1. *QJMS*. Vol. XLII, Pp. 125 ff.

2. *Ep. Ind* Vol. XXVIII, Pp. 38 ff.

3. See *QJMS*. Vol. XXVIII, Pp. 245 ff. for another specimen of this type of criticism of this writer.

4. Sewell in *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XI, P. 253 gave Monday, November 22, 874 A.C. as the English equivalent of the astronomical details contained in this

These English equivalents have been obtained from *An Indian Ephemeris* by L. D. S. Pillai, Vol. II. P. 153.

I maintain that these dates do yield a date of accession for this Varaguṇa which may lie somewhere in 861-62 A. C. Let me demonstrate this point.

The years of reign quoted in these records are to be taken as those that have expired since the accession of the king. The Tiruchendur inscription of Varaguṇa-Maharāja (II)[5] edited by Sri. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyer provides the clue to this mode of reckoning regnal years as the learned editor of that inscription has shown. Thus, the three records mentioned above should be taken to have been issued in the fourteenth current regnal year of the king, 4+9, *i.e.* thirteen years of his rule having elapsed. The latest date cited among these records falls on 6th of December 875 A. C. There is nothing improper or impossible in assuming that the fourteenth current regnal year of the king might have ended soon after, within the month of December itself, say about the 15th of December 875 A. C. Thus we may demonstrate the calculation as follows to arrive at the initial regnal year of this monarch:

16th December, 874 A. C. to 15th December, 875 A. C.	13th year expired: 14th current.
16th December, 873 A. C. to 15th December, 874 A. C.	12th year expired: 13th current.
16th December, 872 A. C. to 15th December, 873 A. C.	11th year expired: 12th current.

inscription and I adopted this equivalent in my article. But, as correctly pointed out by Sri. Vaidyanathan, the adoption of this date results in a difference of over a year between this and those given by me as the equivalents of the dates cited in the other records of Varaguṇa, from Lālguḍi and Javantināthapuram. The date which I have now given above for the Tiruveḷḷarai inscription appears to be the correct one satisfying the astronomical details more closely than the one proposed by Sewell.

5. *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXI. P. 106.

16th December, 871 A. C. to 15th December, 872 A. C.	10th year expired: 11th current.
16th December, 870 A. C. to 15th December, 871 A. C.	9th year expired: 10th current.
16th December, 869 A. C. to 15th December, 870 A. C.	8th year expired: 9th current.
16th December, 868 A. C. to 15th December, 869 A. C.	7th year expired: 8th current.
16th December, 867 A. C. to 15th December, 868 A. C.	6th year expired: 7th current.
16th December, 866 A. C. to 15th December, 867 A. C.	5th year expired: 6th current.
16th December, 865 A. C. to 15th December, 866 A. C.	4th year expired: 5th current.
16th December, 864 A. C. to 15th December, 865 A. C.	3rd year expired: 4th current.
16th December, 863 A. C. to 15th December, 864 A. C.	2nd year expired; 3rd year current.
16th December, 862 A. C. to 15th December, 863 A. C.	1st year expired: 2nd year current.
16th December, 861 A. C. to 15th December, 862 A. C.	....: 1st year current *i.e. the year of accession.*

I hope this demonstration will make it clear that working back from the dates cited in the three records according to the equivalents proposed by me there is every likelihood of this king having come to the throne somewhere in 861-2 A. C. and that there is nothing 'unscientific' in the method adopted. The possibility

that the king ascended the throne towards the end of December of the year cannot be ruled out altogether and due allowance must be made for such a possibility with regard to such calculations of the initial dates proceeding from the dates known.

'*Precisely the same date*' can be arrived at as the king's initial year from the dates, regnal and S'aka years, cited in the Aivarmalai inscription of Pâṇḍya Varaguṇa II. This record mentions the eighth year of the king's reign and couples it with S'aka 792.[6] The year of reign quoted here represents the number of years that have elapsed since the king's accession and this would mean that the ninth regnal year was current when the S'aka year was 792. Now, the S'aka year quoted may be either current or expired. Taking it to be the current S'aka year, it is equivalent to 869-70 A. C.[7] If this is taken as the king's ninth regnal year current then his initial year does fall in 861-2 A. C.[8] which is the one arrived at from the three records of Varaguṇa discussed above.

If, however, Sri. Vaidyanathan wants that I should not express a view different from that of Venkayya, Subrahmanya Aiyer and Nīlakaṇṭa S'āstri and accept like them that 862-3 A. C. was the initial year of this king arrived at on the basis of the Aivarmalai record, even then, I submit the initial year arrived at from the three records ascribed to Varaguṇa II by me and that obtained from the Aivarmalai record can be '*precisely the same*,' *i.e.* 862-3 A.C. For, it can in this case be assumed quite legitimately

6. No. 705 of 1905 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection.

7. See Sewell. *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XI, P. 253 where he expresses the view that the S'aka year may be current.

8. This may be shown as below:

869-70 A. C. = 9th	current	regnal	year	= 8th	expired	year.
868-69 A. C. = 8th	,,	,,	,,	= 7th	,,	,,
867-68 A. C. = 7th	,,	,,	,,	= 6th	,,	,,
866-67 A. C. = 6th	,,	,,	,,	= 5th	,,	,,
865-66 A. C. = 5th	,,	,,	,,	= 4th	,,	,,
864-65 A. C. = 4th	,,	,,	,,	= 3rd	,,	,,
863-64 A. C. = 3rd	,,	,,	,,	= 2nd	,,	,,
862-63 A. C. = 2nd	,,	,,	,,	= 1st	,,	,,
861-62 A. C. = 1st	,,	,,	,,	=		

that the fourteenth current regnal year of the three inscriptions ended not in December of 875 A. C. itself but on some date early in 876 A.C. the next year and that the S'aka year quoted in the Aivarmalai inscription was an expired one. In either case, *i.e.* whether the initial year of this king is taken as 861-62 A. C. or 862-63 A.C. my ascription of the three inscriptions to Varaguṇa II according to the English equivalents worked out and on the basis that they yield the same initial year as that provided by the Aivarmalai record which is definitely assignable to this king is neither 'baseless' nor 'clearly wrong.'

DATE OF ACCESSION OF NANDIVARMAN II PALLAVAMALLA

To use Sri. Vaidyanathan's own expressions the criticisms he has levelled against the views expressed by me about the date of accession of Nandivarman II are 'to say the least inaccurate and indefinite.' Further, he has misquoted me in several places, unfortunately. He says that I have given the figure 24 on page 41 of my article as the latest known regnal year of Nṛipatuṅga, while what I stated on that page 41 was that an inscription of the twenty-fourth year of the reign of Nṛipatuṅga *is found in the same region, i.e.* the Cōḷa country. Again he says that my statements 'are advanced to support latest researches' on the problem of the date of accession of Nandivarman II. He has in this instance omitted to quote, or take account of, a foot-note which I appended under the sentence mentioning the 'latest researches,' a foot-note which draws pointed attention to the important Ulchāla inscription (*Ancient India*, No. 5, January, 1949, P. 54), the information contained in which is now so well-known to scholars and which has a great bearing on the date of Nandivaraman Pallavamalla's accession. Not only have I taken account of the latest researches but also of latest epigraphical documents in coming to the conclusion that the Varaguṇa of the three records mentioned above was Varaguṇa II.

Sri. Vaidyanathan further states that I do not stick uniformally (*sic*) to my dates. He quotes in proof thereof the dates I assigned over fifteen years ago to the Pallava kings. Now, with the discovery of the Ulchāla record the contents of which, in so far

as they bear on the chronology of the Pallava kings have now been placed before scholars by Sri. N. Lakshminarayan Rao,[9] I have no need to offer any apology for not sticking to my old dates, but revising them in the light of later discoveries.

Sri. Vaidyanathan in trying to demonstrate that my assumed Pallava chronology is as unacceptable as my chronology of the Pāṇḍyas makes 'inaccurate and indefinite statements.' He says, 'the accession date of Nandivarman Pallavamalla cannot be placed later than A. D. 724 (the date of Āditya's death A. D. 907 *minus* the sum total of the reigns of Pallavamalla's five successors).' Scholars know of only three successors of Pallavamalla in the regular genealogical sequence, *viz.* Dantivarman, Nandivaman III and Nṛipatuṅga and if Aparājita is considered to have succeeded Nṛipatuṅga as Sri. Vaidyanathan and Sri. K. V. S. Aiyer believe and for which there is not sufficient evidence, there would still be only four successors to Nandivarman Pallavamalla on the throne. Further, since it is not definitely known whether Aparājita immediately followed Nṛipatuṅga, it would be unscientific to add up the regnal years of Aparājita in continuous succession to those of Nṛipatuṅga in calculating the interval between the date of accession of Nāndivarman II and the defeat of Aparājita by Āditya I and more so as we do not as yet know the exact relationship—lineal—that existed between Nṛipatuṅga and Aparājita. Hence, Sri. Vaidyanathan's concluding statement that any date for the accession of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla after A.D. 724 would stand discredited and need not be taken serious note of, on his own premises.

DATE OF THE FINAL CONQUEST OF THE PALLAVA COUNTRY AND ITS ANNEXATION BY THE COLAS

Sri. Vaidyanathan says, "In the light of all the historical and chronological variations of Sri. Venkataramayya we need not pay any heed to his naive suggestion that the date *C.* 890 generally assigned to the final annexation of the Pallava territory from Pallava Aparājita by Cōḷa Āditya I has to be reconsidered." He prefaces this conclusion of his by detailing some of my chronological variations. But I never said anything in my article about

9. *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XXX. Pp. 287 ff.

the S'rīpurambiyam battle in which as all know a Varaguṇa was defeated by a Gaṅga king Pṛithvīpati who is stated to have lost his life in the encounter after securing victory for his friend Aparājita. For, I am of the opinion that the combatants of the battle except Pṛithvīpati and perhaps Aparājita, cannot be definitely identified nor can the date of the battle be fixed with any degree of precision, as already pointed out by Sri. M. Somasekhara Sarma.[10] Hence I avoided all reference to it in my article. Yet Sri. Vaidyanathan attributes to me the view that 'my Varaguṇa was defeated at the great battle of S'rīpurambiyam ' etc.

That there is ample need for the reconsideration of the prevalent opinion of scholars to the effect that the annexation of Pallava territory finally by Āditya I took place before *circa* 890 A.C. is brought out by the recent epigraphical discoveries, *viz*. the Ulchāla record and the Karandai Plates of Rājēndra Cōḷa I. In this connection I need only refer the reader to an article '*Some New Facts About Cōḷa History*' contributed by Sri. N. Lakshminarayan Rao to the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Vol. XIX. Part II, Pp. 148 ff.

I am unable to follow the logic of Sri. Vaidyanathan in his laboured attempt to prove the irrelevancy of my reference to 'Iḍavai of the Cōḷa country' mentioned in a Pāṇḍya inscription of the time of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ from Rāmanāthapuram, Dindigal taluk, Madura district[11] when discussing the name Iḍaiyāṟṟumaṅgalam occurring in the Javantināthapuram inscription. Once again he misquotes me when he says that I identified Iḍavai with Iḍaiyāṟṟumaṅgalam. My suggestion was to the effect that Iḍaiyaṟṟunāḍu, (not Iḍaiyāṟṟumaṅgalam) was perhaps the 'Iḍavai in Cōḷa-nāḍu' against which the Pāṇḍya king is stated to have gone on a campaign. If there is another Iḍavai, a village in Maṇṇi-nāḍu mentioned in inscriptions much later than the period of Māṟañjaḍaiyan, how could my suggestion that Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāḍu may be the 'Iḍavai of S'ōḷa-nāḍu against which the Pāṇḍya went on a

10. *Journal of Oriental Research*. Vol. IX, Pp. 227 ff.

11. *A. R.* No. 690 of 1905.

campaign,'[12] be irrelevant when this is more likely in consideration of the contemporaneity of the inscriptional references?

Towards the end of his invective against me Sri. Vaidyanathan says that no Tamil knowing person would equate an *agrahāra* village (*maṅgalam*, *Chaturvēdimaṅgalam*) with *puram* a mercantile quarter, etc. as has been done by me. I do not claim any profundity of knowledge in the Tamil language, nor for that matter in any language, the study of which I approach in the spirit of

---

12. The text of the inscription reads at this place as follows:

S'rī Kō-Mâṟañjaḍaiyaṉ=ōḍu S'ōḷa-nāṭṭ=Iḍavai-yāttirai s'ēyda Parântakapaḷḷi-vēḷâṉ=âyiṉa Nakkam-Puḷḷâṉ.

Since this inscription mentioning this Vēḷâṉ is found at Râmanâthapuram, Dindigal taluk, a region corresponding to the ancient territorial division called Aṇḍa-nâḍu, one wonders if the person Aṇḍa-nàṭṭu-Vēḷāṉ who figures in the three records of Varaguṇa II from Lâlguḍi, Javantinâthapuram and Tiruveḷḷarai discussed in this article might be identical with Parântakappaḷḷi-vēḷâṉ.

A Note: It seems to me more likely that the Iḍavai of S'ōḷa-nàḍu was a region and not a village since a campaign against a village like Iḍavai would hardly be an appropriate objective of a king's military expedition and much less for pointed mention as has been done in the inscription cited above. It also seems incredible that a *brahmadēya* village like Iḍavai in Maṇṇi-nàḍu would have been a king's target of campaign. Further it is significant to note that the Trichinopoly inscription of Mārañjaḍaiyaṉ Varaguṇa (*Arch. Sur. of India*, Report for 1903-4, P. 275) a king with whom I identify the Māraññjaḍaiyaṉ of the Ràmanáthapuram record quoted above makes no mention of Iḍavai village while listing other places either destroyed by the king or in which he camped. Apart from all this the very presence of the Pâṇḍyan king along with an Anḍanáṭṭu-vēḷāṉ in the region of Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāḍu inclines me to identify the Iḍavai of the Cōḷa country with Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nàḍu in preference to its identification with Iḍavai in Maṇṇi-nàḍu proposed tentatively by Venkayya.

Instances of both names of places and of Territorial Divisions having shorter forms are not unknown. *Cf.* Malāḍu for Malai-nāḍu (*S. I. I.* Vol. II, Introd. P. 27, and Pp. 167 and *n.* and 229 *n.*), Navilai for Navile-nāḍ (*Cōḷas*, Vol. II. P. 13). Koḍumbai for Koḍumbàḷūr, etc. As for the interpretation of Iḍaiyàṟṟu-náḍu, compare Iḍaituṟai-nāḍu (*S. I. I.* Vol. III, Introd. P. 17; *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XII P. 296)), Sindhu-yugmāntara-dēs'a (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. IV P. 35. 50 and 303) and Reṇḍērula naḍimi-viṣaya (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. IV, Pp. 302 and 303) occurring in epigraphs. In equating Iḍaiyaṟṟunāḍu with S'ōḷa-nāṭṭu Iḍavai no offence to the Tamil language nor to its votaries has been offered. (*Contra: QJMS* Vol. XLIII. No. 2. P. 76.)

udbāhur=iva vāmanaḥ. But it is important to mention Sri. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyer who, like me, has equated a *maṅgalam* with a *puram* in the *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy for the year* 1930-31, Part II, Para 2. P. 38, where he says that Mahēndramaṅgalam was the name applied to Tirunārāyaṇapuram. In the *Annual Report on Epigraphy* for the year 1910 on P. 86, Para 32, Rao Bahadur Krishna Sastri has described in detail, on the evidence afforded by inscriptions, how S'ōḻapuram, a village in the Rāmanādhapuram district, was originally called Sundara-Pāṇḍya-chaturvēdimaṅgalam and subsequently renamed Uttama-S'ōḻa-chaturvēdimaṅgalam. Mahādānapuram, Kulittalai taluk, Tiruchchirāppaḻḻi district, is called S'ōḻakulamāṇikka-chaturvēdi-maṅgalam in inscriptions of the place. Tirukkaṇṇapuram, Tanjore district is described as a *brahmadēya* in inscriptions at the place. Such instances can be cited *ad infinitum.*

M. VENKATARAMAYYA.

A CORRECTION

The words, "(the country to the left of the river)" on page 24 line 3 of Vol. XLIII No. 1 of the Journal may be treated as omitted as desired by the author.

ED.

I am obliged to the Editor of the *QJMS* in having sent me Sri. M. Venkataramayya's reply to my "Note on the Javanti-nāthapuram Inscription of Varaguṇa" published in *QJMS* Vol. XLII, Pages 125-130, for expressing my views thereon before publishing it. I am placing before scholars the following for consideration along with the reply of Sri. M. Venkataramayya.

Sri. Venkataramayya has not met any of the points raised in my note[1] on his article on the Javantināthapuram Inscription of Varaguṇa Mahārāja. In his note, he only reveals his disregard for all explicit statements and simple facts mentioned in epigraphs and

1. *QJMS* XLII. Pp. 126-130.

copper-plates. His attempts are therefore neither a reconsideration of established facts nor a reconstruction of history from all known facts.

I pointed out that the ascription of the records dated in 4+(?) years of the reign of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ to the second king of the name Varaguṇa *in preference* to the first king must be done on valid reasons and that his preference to his set of the English equivalents to the dates, to those given by the earlier authors Sri. M. S. Sarma and Sri K. V. S. Aiyer "must be accompanied by cogent and valid reasoning as to the disposal of the two other sets. Until he has it done, he has no grounds to speak of others." He has failed to do this even in this note.

In my note I made it clear that whereas the early authors have given equivalents of the dates of the Tiruveḷḷaṟai and the Lalgudi (B) inscriptions in the same year, Sri. Venkataramayya erred in giving the equivalent of the date of the Tiruveḷḷaṟai record as 379 days earlier to his date of the Lalgudi (B) record and that in the face of such a glaring discrepancy, which he himself failed to notice, he observes "the date equivalents proposed by Sri. Venkataramayya in order to show that they compel him to prefer his set to any other alternative is not only baseless but compels one to the conclusion that the ascription of the inscriptions with these dates to Varaguṇa II is clearly wrong." In his note he discloses the fact that he had followed 'An Indian Ephemeris by L. D. S. Pillai' for two dates and Sewell's calculations for the third date and that this had landed him in the mistake. That he did not depend on the Ephemeris by L.D.S. Pillai for the third date but quoted Sewell was evidently because he erroneously thought that Sewell's date would support him. He has now come to see that the dates are irreconcilable. Realising this grave mistake he now says that Sewell, whom he formerly quoted, is wrong, and that the new date equivalent given by him in this note, "appears to be the correct one satisfying the astronomical details more closely than the one proposed by Sewell." That his procedure had been unscientific has become plain to him now, after he made a mistake, which he came to note only after my pointing it out to him, is clear from

his admission of the mistake. He has relegated his acknowledgment of this major mistake to a foot-note.

Finding that his earlier equivalents did not yield a uniform accession date for Varaguṇa II, as pointed out by me, he now shifts his position and gives a new date to make a uniform set and maintains that they yield a date of accession "*somewhere in 861-62 A.C.*" He cites Sri. K. V. S. Aiyer to show that the regnal years in these inscriptions "are to be taken as those that have expired since the accession of the king." In Sri. Aiyer's edition of the Tiruchchendūr inscription of Varaguṇa Mahārāja (II) he tries to find support for this procedure. The citation is quite different and goes only against him. That the readers may not be misguided I quote the relevent passage from Sri. Aiyer's article.

"The inscription belongs to the reign of the *Pāṇḍya king Varaguṇa Mahārāja (II)*. The *date* portion occurring in the second line of the record is lost, but so much of it is seen that *the year opposite* is found to be *thirteen*. In the seventh line, *the day of the regnal year* of the king is given as *5001* in words which yields *13 years* of 365 days *and 256 days*. We may take the days as referring to 'the year opp osite' and not to the entire regnal year. Examples of similar dating are found in a few inscriptions. No. 502 of the Madras Epigraphical Collection for 1916 is dated in the 13th year and 3090th day as well as in the 8th year opposite to the 13th. Similarly also No. 534 of the same collection is dated in the 4th year and 1745th day as well as in the 4th year opposite to the 4th. Again in No. 509, the year given at the commencement of the record is "13th year and 1445th day" while in the body the same is indicated by '3rd year opposite to the 13th. These instances are sufficient to make it clear that the days given refer only to the number of years and days passed after the first mentioned year and not to the entire regnal year."[2]

Sri. Aiyer has himself pointed out that there are a few instances where a particular method of dating is adopted. In these it is invariably found that there is some definite data to declare categorically that the references are to "the number of years and days

2. *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXI. P.106.

passed after the first mentioned year and not to the entire regnal year." But these cannot always prove the rule which has been assumed by Sri. Venkataramayya, that "the year of reign quoted in these records are to be taken as those that have expired since the accession of the king" and that the three records under discussion, should be taken to have been issued in the fourteenth current regnal year of the king, 4+9, *i.e.* "13 years of his rule having elapsed." This is certainly a very peculiar method of taking the clearly expressed date.

In so far as there is no other date given inside these three records, as is invariably the case in all the instances pointed out by Sri. Aiyer, there is no ground for Sri. Venkataramayya to take 4+9th year of the three records as referring to any other year than the 13th regnal year. If the composers of the inscriptions wanted to indicate that the current year was not thirteen but fourteen, they would certainly have noted the second date expressed in number of days—as is invariably found in all the instances cited by Sri. K. V. S. Aiyer, on which Sri. Venkataramayya now tries to base his assumptions.

Thus it will be plain that unless there is any internal evidence to prove that the given regnal year or S'aka year in an epigraph or copper-plate, is a reference to the expired year, one is not warranted to take it as such. They must be taken only as current regnal years as had hitherto been done. This fact is also amply demonstrated by the calculations of the A.D. equivalents of the dates of the Tiruveḷḷaṟai and Aivarmalai inscriptions by Sewell, which Sri. Venkataramayya had accepted in his article and which he abandons now. Sewell calculated the details of the date of the Tiruveḷḷaṟai inscription, "on the *supposition* that it might refer to that of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ whose reign is said to have begun in A. D. 862-3" [3] and taking 4+9th year to be a reference to the 13th year he equated it with Monday, November 22nd A.D. 874.[4] He concluded that "this king's reign began some time between November 23rd, A.D. 861 and November 22nd, A.D. 862, always supposing

3. *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XI. P.253.
4. *Ibid.*

that 'in the ninth year opposite the fourth year' means 'in the thirteenth year.'" He said further that "coupling with this the date given in the Aivarmalai record [5] which makes S' 792 synchronous with the king's eighth year, we have for his accession the period March 22nd to November 22nd A.D. 862. This presupposes that the quoted S'aka year 792 was the current year.[6]" Thus we see that the eighth year and the S'aka year in the Aivarmalai inscription and the 4+9th year of the Tiruveḷḷaṟai inscription are only current years and are not expired ones as has been wrongly taken by Sri. Venkataramayya.

Assuming as Sewell did that the S'aka year is current and assuming that the 8th regnal year is expired, Sri. Venkataramayya says that the initial year of the king falls in 861-2 A.C. There is no warrant for taking, as Sri. Venkataramayya has taken, the 8th year given here as an expired one. It will be equally unwarranted to treat the S'aka year as expired and the regnal year as current. If one should be just to the composer of the grant one should take both of them as current years, or both of them as expired years. Now, if both are taken as current years, the 8th year being coupled with S'. 792 is A.D. 869-70, and the accession date of the king works out to A.D. 862-3. If both are taken as expired years, *as Sri. Venkataramayya has assumed finally*, then the ninth year, current being S' 792 expired *i.e.* 870-1 A. D., gives the date of accession as A. D. 862-3. On both these assumptions it is clear that the date of accession of the Varaguṇa Mahārāja of the Aivarmalai inscription was only A. D. 862-3, as has so far been correctly taken by Messrs. Venkayya, K. V. S. Aiyer, Sewell and K. A. N. Sastri and was definitely not A. D. 861-2, as Sri. Venkataramayya demonstrates. He says in one place that the 8th year was expired while its corresponding Śaka date was current, and in another place that the 4 + 9th is not the thirteenth but the fourteenth current regnal year. Having made the date of the three records as well as that of the other inscription from Aivarmalai as expired ones, he is constrained to assume further that the

5. *Ibid.* Vol. IX P. 88.
6. *Ibid.*

S'aka year is also an expired one, for both of which there is little or no ground. He is compelled to shift from his earlier statement and that the fourteenth current regnal year "ended not in December of 875 A. C. itself but on some date early in 876 A. C. the next year and that the S'aka year quoted in the Aivarmalai inscription was an expired one." I may add that in both the cases the accession dates 861-2 A. C. and 812-3 A. C. arrived at by him are not one and the same. It will be abundantly clear from the above noted quotation from Sewell's article that the commencement of the year of accession of Varaguṇa of the Aivarmalai inscription cannot have been earlier than "March 22nd, A. D. 862" and that therefore Sri. Venkataramayya's statement that "the possibility that the king ascended the throne towards the end of December of the year" 861 A. C. "cannot be ruled out altogether" becomes completely baseless. I have shown above that his new theory of taking the regnal years as expired ones as well as the method of considering the regnal year as expired and the corresponding Śaka year as current in the Aivarmalai inscription will not stand scrutiny.

Varaguṇa's accession date was A.D. 862-3, as has been correctly taken so far by Messrs. Venkayya, K. V. S. Aiyer, Sewell and K. A. N. Sastri and the regnal years in the three records under discussion are only current years. There is nothing to indicate that they are expired ones as Sri. Venkataramayya presumes.

When he comes to Pallava Pāṇḍya synchronisms he says that he has taken into account not only the latest researches but also the latest epigraphical documents in coming to the conclusion that the Varaguṇa of the three records was Varaguṇa II. He has not given proof of this either in the Epigraphia Indica where he edited the Javantināthapuram Inscription or in his note published in this journal, though he had two opportunities to show on what his conclusions were based. In so far as he has given only his statements without deducing them from any grounds or facts revealed in the latest researches or in latest epigraphical documents, his conclusions are mainly assumptions without foundation. He now simply refers to the articles of Sri N. Lakshminarayan Rao, but

does not say what facts have been established in them, a consideration of which has led him to conclude as he has done that the Varaguṇa of the three records is Varaguṇa II. He has simply said that they compel him to prefer his set of English equivalents to the dates of these three records in preference to what had been proposed by the earlier scholars. He has not demonstrated his position viewed from all sides of historical facts and showed the untenability of the dates of the earlier authors. That is why I said, and still say, that his statements are not only inconclusive and incomplete but that he has put no new argument to prove the calculations or dates of the earlier authors to be wrong as also their ascription of the records to Varaguṇa, the first of that name.

I fear a great misconstruction has been made of a very plain statement found in the Ulchāla record. Sri. Venkataramayya would have done some justice to the problem at least if he had given a discussion of the actual contents of the Ulchāla record and its bearing on the Pallava and Pāṇḍya Chronology, before he began to attack others. There is no fact, that is not already known, which is furnished in the Ulchāla inscription.[7] Sri. Venkataramayya is yet to state how the revelations revealed in the inscription supports the final stand he has taken. In any case the touchstone for testing the correctness of the chronology of Nandivarman II's line is the date when the Pallava dominion was lost by Aparājita *i. e. circa* A. D. 890.

I am sorry to note that a mistake has occurred in the clause inside brackets in the part of the sentence "the accession date of Nandivarman Pallavamalla cannot be placed later than A. D. 724 (the date of Āditya's death A. D. 907 *minus* the sum total of the reigns of Pallavamalla's five successors)" occurring in page 128 of my note.[8] Of this Sri. Venkataramayya makes much. It should have been '(the date of Āditya's death A. D. 907 *minus* the sum total of the reigns of Pallavamalla and his four successors).' That this is what I had meant will be clear to anyone from the preceding paragraph to which this bracketed clause refers.

7. *Ancient India*, No. 5. P. 54.
8. *QJMS*. Vol. XLII P. 128.

Sri. Venkataramayya has been unable to meet my argument that "according to his dates, his Varaguṇa II (Accn. 861-2) started his career as the overlord of his Pallava contemporary Nandivarman III (851-73), became the vassal of his second Pallava contemporary Nṛipatuṅga (873-99) and was defeated at the great battle of S'rīpurambiyam by a subordinate of his third Pallava contemporary Aparājita (899-917) and was still not dead. It is well-known that Āditya I (870-907) the predecessor of Parāntaka I defeated and killed Aparājita and that Varaguṇa's brother's son Rājasiṁha Pāṇḍya was defeated by the Cōḷa king Parāntaka I prior to A. D. 910." This proves that his Pallava Pāṇḍya chronolgy is inaccurate. On page 40 of his article in the Epigraphia Indica, he considers that some of the records of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ with dates opposite to the thirty-fifth may belong to Varaguṇa II. Without proving his position to be correct he now dilates on a different point, *viz.* that he did not at all mention the S'rīpurambiyam battle and that he has studiously avoided a reference to it in view of his opinion, which he now expresses, "that the combatants of the battle except Pṛithvīpati and perhaps Aparājita, cannot be definitely identified nor can the date of the battle be fixed with any degree of precision." But the contemporaneity of Varaguṇa II with Pṛithvīpati and Aparājita cannot be wiped out. So long as not even a single inscription of the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ is ascribed to Varaguṇa II by proper and unassailable grounds he cannot be assigned a reign of thirty-five years and more. And so long as another Varaguṇa is not discovered to take his stand in the S'rīpurambiyam battle against Pṛithvīpati and Aparājita, the reign of Varaguṇa II, whom Sri. Venkataramayya has taken to be the contemporary of Nandivarman III and Nṛipatuṅga, must be extended to a few more years of the reign of Aparājita. The deliberate omission to take into account Varaguṇa's existence in the reign of Nṛipatunga's successor Aparājita proves the awareness of Sri. Venkataramayya of this fact also.

He is wrong when he says (i) that myself and Sri. K. V. S. Aiyer believe that Aparājita succeeded Nṛipatunga, (ii) that "it is not definitely known whether Aparājita immediately followed

Nṛipatunga" and (iii) that "we do not as yet know the exact relationship—lineal—that obtained between Nṛipatuṅga and Aparājita." Varaguṇa's contemporaneity first with Nṛipatuṅga and then with Aparājita and his ally Pṛithvīpati establishes beyond any shadow of doubt that the latter was the immediate successor of the former. It is quite unnecessary for chronological purposes to know whether one is a lineal descendant of another or not. That, one was the immediate successor of another is all that is required. As Sri. Venkataramayya suggests, it is not myself and Sri. K. V. S. Aiyer alone that believe that Nṛipatuṅga was succeeded by Aparājita but a host of scholars including Messrs. Venkayya[9], Nilakanta Sastri[10] and Venkatasubba Ayyar[11] believe in this fact of history. Until Sri. Venkataramayya produces enough and authentic evidence to show that Aparājita did not immediately succeed Nṛipatuṅga he has no ground to question the established opinions of other scholars. Neither can he disprove the facts that Nṛipatuṅga was the contemporary of Varaguṇa II (Accn. 862-3), nor that Aparājita was defeated and killed by Āditya I (Accn. 870). In the face of all these I fail to see how it is unscientific to add up the reign of Aparājita to those of Nṛipatuṅga and his predecessors. He has himself followed this method of adding up the highest regnal years of successive kings on page 40 of his article in the Epigraphia Indica.

The fact that Iḍaiyāṟṟumaṇgalam corresponds to modern Edayattimangalam lays bare the incorrectness of Sri. Venkataramayya's equating it with Javantināthapuram and this mistake he has already owned in *QJMS*. Vol. XLIII. No. 1. P. 23. He still seems to labour under the idea that Iḍavai of Cōḻanāḍu mentioned in the Rāmanāthapuram inscription is a reference to a region and not to a particular village of that name, that it is the same as Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāḍu and that Iḍavai stands as the shortened form of Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāḍu, rather than for the village of Iḍavai in Maṇṇi-nāḍu

9. Aparājita was perhaps the successor of Nṛipatunga and probably, his son. *A. R.* for 1906. P. 65.

10. Aparājita was the successor of Nṛipatunga. Pāṇḍyan Kingdom. P. 77.

11. Nṛipatunga was immediately succeeded by Aparājita and Kampavarmāṉ was a co-regent of both. *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXVIII. P. 144-5.

referred to in other inscriptions. He has not produced a single inscriptional reference to show that Iḍavai was the curtailed form of Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāḍu. But as the region is indicated by the term Cōḻa-nāḍu the reference is only to the place Iḍavai and not to a region. While Cōḻa-nāḍu denoted the region into which the Pāṇḍya marched, Maṇṇi-nāḍu was the territorial division within which this Iḍavai was included. Thus his equation of Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāḍu with Cōḻa-nāṭṭu-Iḍavai stands disproved.

It is curious to find that every time [12] Sri. Venkaṭaramayya wants a contemporaneous record to mention the identical village or a different territorial division, when he finds that his conclusions are proved incorrect. In this instance he says the existence of a village called Iḍavai in Maṇṇi-nāḍu revealed in the "inscription much later than the period of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ" will not be enough. I have to point out only that in so far as he himself has not been able to cite a single evidence to establish the identity of Iḍavai with the regional name of Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāḍu proposed by him, he cannot question the correctness of the equation of Iḍavai with the place of the same name occurring in another inscription proposed by Sri. Venkayya. This inscriptional evidence which Sri. Venkataramayya is inclined to regard as "much later than the period of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ" [13] is actually not so, but as has been correctly conceded by Sri. K. A. N. Sastri, belongs only "to a slightly later date." Without citing any inscription in support of his equation, he wants a contemporaneous record to show that Iḍavai of Cōḻa-nāḍu was not different from Iḍavai of Maṇṇi-nādu in the Cōḻa country.

His conclusions that 'Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāda was the region situated between the rivers Kaveri and Kollidam (Coleroon) is proved to be incorrect by the inscriptions themselves. They declare that it extended south of the river and included portions round Tiruchchiṉṉampūṇḍi in the Tanjore district. The actual wordings of the

12. See *QJMS* Vol. XLIII. P. 22 and *Ibid*, P. 75 for an answer.

13. Iḍavai has been identified with the village of the same name in the Cōḻa country referred to in the Cōḻa inscription of a slightly later date. Pāṇḍyan Kingdom. P. 76.

epigraphs while referring to the God at that place is "*Teṉkarai Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāṭṭut — Tiruchchaḍaimuḍi Mahādēvar.*" The application of the '*Teṉkarai-Iḍaiyāṟṟu-Nādu*' and the location of Tiruchchiṉṉampūṇḍi south of the Coleroon in the map of the Tanjore taluk, shows the incorrectness of the interpretation given by Sri. Venkataramayya to the term Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāḍu, as the region between the two rivers, the Kaveri and Kollidam. The epigraphs disclose the actual extent of this territorial division, as laying on both sides of Coleroon river, including parts of the Tiruchchirāpaḷḷi and Tanjore districts.

K. S. VAIDYANATHAN.

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE MYTHIC SOCIETY

BANGALORE-2

Best Medium of Advertisement

Has wide circulation throughout the world.

Rates of Advertisement:	Cover Page 4	Cover Pages 2 and 3	Other pages
Full page for 4 issues	Rs. 160	Rs. 140	Rs. 120
Half page for 4 issues or one page for 2 issues	Rs. 85	Rs. 75	Rs. 65
Quarter page for 4 issues or full page for one issue	No quarter page advertisements accepted.		Rs. 35

All communications regarding advertisements to be sent to:

The General Secretary & Treasurer

The Mythic Society

Daly Memorial Hall, Cenotaph Road

BANGALORE-2

(INDIA).

REVIEWS

Kadar of Cochin. By U. R. Ehrenfels. Madras University Anthropological Series No. 1. Published by the University of Madras, Madras-5. Price Rs. 10-0-0.

In the pages of this journal have been published before, accounts of various forest tribes.* The late L. K. Anantakrishna Iyer and his son L. A. Krishna Iyer and others have done pioneer work on Cochin Castes and Tribes. In this profusely illustrated work, Dr. U. R. Ehrenfels who has already written a work on 'Mother Right in India' has undertaken a detailed field research about the Kadar of Cochin. The Kadar is a food-gathering tribe of South-western India. We regret to note that the culture of many of these tribes is in complete disintegration just as the joint family of ancient India is fast disintegrating and disappearing. The care and industry of the author remind us of the great work undertaken by Rev. Father Elwin with regard to the Central Indian tribes. Most of the Hindu customs and the Hindu modes of life as they existed have continued to persist in this part of the world in the backward or forest tribes in the ordinarily inaccessible places in India and this work which reveals the picture of the Kadar is a substantial contribution to the science of social anthropology. Field work has occupied a considerable time, naturally, and we congratulate the author on the excellent work which he has placed

* Peringal Vettuvans, Q J M S, Vol. I. Pp. 146-151 and P. 154; Primitive Tribes of India. Vol. V. Pp. 140-149; Wild Tribes of the Vizagapatam Hills. Vol. VIII. P. 8-17; Muduvans of Travancore, Vol. XV. Pp. 32-42 and 128-137; A Preliminary Note on the Hill Pandarams of Travancore, Vol. XVIII. Pp. 181-183; The Malayarans of Travancore. Vol. XVIII. Pp. 241-245, Vol. XIX. Pp. 101-109, 182-188 and Vol. XX. Pp. 196-200; The Religion of the Primitive Tribes of Travancore. Vol. XXIV. Pp. 193-201; Taboo Among the Primitive Tribes of Travancore. Vol. XXV. Pp. 95-102; Abhiras in the Deccan. Vol. XXX. Pp. 147-162; Boyis of Baroda. Vol. XXXI. Pp. 92-103; The Interpenetration of the Aryan and the Aboriginal Culture in India with special reference to the Soras (Savaras). Vol. XXXVIII. Pp. 167-179; Vol. XXXIX. Pp. 29-39 and 95-100.

before the public. Kadan sociology betrays the marks of different and opposing foreign influences. Sons, as well as nephews, can inherit. Dr. Ehrenfels has collected individual biographies of these aborigines and has made use of them in this work. His discussion of the Kadar religion, of the analysis of religious concepts and of the Kadar Language introduces the primitive religion in an interesting way. He has opened up new fields in anthropologico-psychological research by his deep study. I do not think it would be possible to rehabilitate these dying races just as it is not possible to reinstal the Vedic Āryan family, reconstruct an *agrahāra* or restore an old forest *as'rama.*

S. S.

Indian Astrology. (Ashtottari and Vinshottari Dashas). By Ramniklal R. Mody. Solicitor, High Court, Bombay. "Kusum Villa," Alexandra Road, Gamvadi, Bombay-7. Price Rs. 3-0-0.

THE subject dealt with in the book is rather difficult but the author has given an excellent, readable and intelligent account about the calculations of the span of human life, of the assignment of the four and three asterisms or *nakṣatras* to the planets in the ashtottari dasha and the planetary periods in both the dashas. The chapter on *Rāhu* and *Kētu* and the interpretation of their influence on the horoscopes will really be useful. Naturally man is anxious to know about his future whether he shall be wealthy or poor; and how he is influenced by the planets is also stated in the book. It is not easy to discuss in detail the various aspects dealt with in the book. Practical experience is the best guide and the reader will greatly benefit by a detailed study of this handy reference book.

S. S.

Descriptive Catalogue of the Pāli Manuscripts in the Adyar Library. By Dr. E. W. Adikaram, M.A., Ph. D. (Lond.). The Adyar Library Series No. 62. Published by the Adyar Library, Adyar, Madras-20. Price Rs. 6-0-0.

BUDDHISM is regaining its lost foothold in India and in the Adyar Library—one of the biggest libraries in India devoted to our

ancient literature—is found a vast and rich collection of Pāli manuscripts. We are grateful to Dr. Adikaram for the descriptive Catalogue of the Pāli manuscripts which he has prepared and presented to the public. There are forty-seven volume with 24,156 pages which are referred to in this catalogue, consisting of Buddhist scriptures in Pāli, Saṁskrit, Japanese, Chinese and Tibetan on the *tālipat* leaves. The Buddhist section of the Adyar Library consisting of these books forms one of the most important collections in the world and it is to be hoped that there will be students forthcoming who will turn to the study of these valuable manuscripts and will place the results of their research before the public.

S. S.

SYMBOLISM OF THE YAJNOPAVITA

BY

S. SRIKANTAYA

Price Re. 1-8-0 or 3 Shillings or 75 Cents

Mr. Srikantaya's well-written and correctly-documented pamphlet is bound to be welcomed by students of Hindu ritualism and social anthropology.

—*The Indian Express.*

The monograph is illustrated by diagrams of Gods. It is an interesting thesis and well-written.

—*The Hindu.*

The Mythic Society

(Founded in 1909)

(Registered Under Act III of 1904)

The Society promotes the study of Archæology, Anthropology, Art, Architecture, Ethnology, Folk-lore, History, Mythology, Philosophy, Religion and other allied subjects more particularly in Mysore and Southern India and stimulates research in the above subjects.

The activities of the Society are:

(*a*) To publish a Quarterly Journal containing original research articles on subjects connected with the objects of the Society and the transactions of the Society, (*b*) to arrange for lectures from eminent scholars, and (*c*) to maintain a library and a free reading room.

Privileges of membership:

(*a*) Free supply of the journal, (*b*) use of the library and reading room, (*c*) lectures, intimation of which will be given to members in Bangalore, (*d*) to bring their friends to lectures, (*e*) to purchase the publications of the Society at a discount of 6¼%, (*f*) to have the privilege of Rules 105 of the Rules of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and (*g*) to vote at the Annual Meeting.

Contributions are accepted from scholars on subjects connected with our objects. They must be type-written or legibly written on one side of the paper only. Contributors are entitled to **two dozen** reprints of their contributions free of cost.

Books on Indology are reviewed in the Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society. All books intended for review may be sent to the Editor.

Advertisement charges, etc. may be obtained on application.

Membership Subscription:

Rs. 5—0—0, or 10 shillings, or $ 2.50 per year.

Rs. 100—0—0, or £. 10—0—0, or $ 50 Life-membership.

Special Numbers of the Journal

The Silver Jubilee Volume	**Rs. 6-12-0**	Packing and
Sri Krishnaraja Memorial Number	**Rs. 4-8-0**	Postage Extra

Further details can be had from:

The General Secretary and Treasurer
THE MYTHIC SOCIETY
(Daly Memorial Hall)
Cenotaph Road, BANGALORE-2
(INDIA.)

PUBLICATIONS & REPRINTS
FOR SALE

		Rs.	As.	*Sh.*	*d.*	$.cts.
1.	Essay on Guṇādhya and the Bṛhatkatha, by A. M. Tabard Pp. 1—42 ...	2	0	4	0	1.00
2.	Do do Pp. 1—92 ...	4	0	8	0	2.00
3.	Kannada Passages in the Oxyrhyncus Papyri, No. 413, by S. Srikantaya ...	1	0	2	0	0.50
4.	Indian Music, by D. B. Ramachandra Mudaliar	0	8	0	8	0.25
5.	Asvattaman (by Sri) : A Critical Study by S. Srikantaya	0	12	1	4	0.60
6.	The Birthplace of Buddha, By A. M. Tabard ...	1	0	2	0	0.50
7.	The Exploits of King Kampila and Kumara Ramanatha, by M. H Rama Sharma ...	2	0	4	0	1.00
8.	The Solar Signs in Indian Literature, by B. V. Kameswara Ayyar ...	0	4	0	6	0.12
9.	Kailasa Pilgrimage of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore (Sri Krishnaraja Wadiyar Bahadur IV), by S. Srikantaya ...	1	4	2	4	0.65
10.	Heavenly Mansions of the Hindus, by S. Srikantaya	2	8	5	0	1.25
11.	Founders of Vijayanagara, by S. Srikantaya ...	5	0	10	0	2.50
12.	Modern Mysore, by M. Shama Rao, Two Vols.	10	0	20	0	5.0
13.	Report of the Gilgit Excavation in 1938, by M. S. Kaul Sastri	1	8	3	0	0.75
14.	Proceedings of the Annual Meetings of the Mythic Society, XX and onwards each ...	0	4	0	4	0.12
15.	Balacarita, by Prof. K. R. Pisharoti, M.A. ...	0	6	0	6	0.15
16.	Sri Krishnaraja Wadiyar IV, by S. Srikantaya	1	0	2	0	0.50
17.	Talk with the Planchette ...	2	0	4	0	1.00
18.	Symbolism of the Yajnopavita ...	1	8	3	0	0.75
19.	Index to QJMS for each Volume (if available) ...	0	6	0	6	0.12
20.	Back Numbers of the QJMS Vols. I to V, VII & X onwards ... per Volume	8	0	16	0	4.00
21.	Do do per Issue (If available)	2	8	4	8	1.50

(Packing, Postage, etc. Extra)

Can be had from :—

The General Secretary & Treasurer
Mythic Society, Daly Memorial Hall
Cenotaph Road, Bangalore-2
(INDIA)

London Agents :

Messrs. ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN,
41, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.

The Modi Power Printing Works, Bangalore City.